NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCXCIII

AUGUST, 1913

THE DIRECT RULE OF THE PEOPLE

BY GEORGE KENNAN

At no period, probably, in their history, have all classes of the American people been more generally wealthy and prosperous than they are to-day. Not only are professional men, railroad men, merchants, farmers, and factory operatives earning more than they ever earned before, but most of them are living more comfortably than ever before, and, at the same time, are saving a larger part than ever before of the money that they earn. Since 1870—that is, within a period of about forty years—the wealth of the United States has increased at a rate that is almost unrealizable, if not unbelievable. As the figures that measure this wealth run up into the millions and billions, and as it is difficult to grasp mentally the quantities that these figures stand for, I shall borrow from the chief of the Bureau of Statistics a simple illustration intended to show what a billion means.

We all know how rapidly an expert counter of coins will manipulate them. The experts of the Treasury Department, in Washington, count about four thousand silver dollars every hour, and keep it up all day long, working eight hours a day; then, an expert counter of coins will count thirty-two thousand silver dollars a day, and this is about his limit of speed. At that rate, he will count a million dollars in just a month. But a million is only the begin-

Copyright, 1913, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ning of the measurement of great figures. If this same man should go on counting silver dollars, at the same rate of speed, he would count only one hundred million of them in ten years. To count a billion, he would have to work hard, every day, for a period of one hundred and two years. When, therefore, reference is made to billions of dollars, as representing the earnings or savings of the American people, please remember that a billion is a thousand times as much as a million, and that to count a billion dollars would occupy the time of an expert accountant for more than a century.

Bearing this in mind, let us look at the increase in the earning capacity of the American people during the past forty years. I will take first farms, because a large part of the wealth of every nation is derived from the soil. How have the farmers prospered during our generation? The value of the wheat, corn, cotton, and other agricultural products, raised on the farms of the United States, in the twelve months ended December 31, 1870, was a little less than two billion dollars. The value of the same products raised in the twelve months ended December 31, 1912, was estimated at nine billions, or a sum that it would take nearly a thousand years to count. In 1870, nine billion dollars was the total value of all the farms in the United States. In 1911, American farms were valued at forty-one billions, a sum that it would take about four thousand years to count.

But perhaps farmers have been more prosperous than other people. Take, then, the next largest class, the laborers who work in factories and mills. In 1870, the industrial workers of the United States were earning, in wages, seven hundred and seventy-five million dollars a year. In 1911, they were earning three billion five hundred million dollars, or nearly five times as much.

Earnings, however, are largely used up in living expenses, and a farmer, mechanic, or merchant may earn a good deal without saving much. Has this been the case in the United States? When a man earns more than he needs for the payment of his living expenses, he usually puts his surplus cash in a bank. Bank deposits, therefore, show how fast a nation is getting ahead. In 1870, the individual deposits, in all the banks of the United States, were two billion dollars. In 1912, they had increased to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seventeen billions, or a sum that it would take one thousand seven hundred and thirty-four years to count.

It may be thought, perhaps, that this immense amount of surplus money is in possession of a comparatively small number of capitalists, and that the great mass of the people are relatively poor. Such, however, does not seem to be the case. Wealthy capitalists invest their money, for the most part, in stocks or bonds; and if they deposit it in banks, they put it in national banks or trust companies. The great mass of the people, on the other hand, and particularly the wage-earners, put their surplus cash into savings-banks, and the deposits in savings-banks, therefore, show how the common people are getting along. In 1870, the number of Americans who had savings-bank accounts was only one million six hundred thousand. In June, 1912, the number of such people had increased to more than ten million. In 1870, the total deposits in the savings-banks of the United States were only five hundred and fifty million dollars. In 1912, they had increased to four billion five hundred and fifty million, or a sum that it would take four hundred and sixty years to count. There has been an increase of two hundred and forty million dollars in savings-bank deposits in the last twelve months.

These figures, which are taken from the reports of the Bureau of Statistics and Comptroller of the Currency, seem to show conclusively that, in the last forty years, an overwhelming majority of the American people have not only raised their standard of living, but have increased enormously the amount of their earnings and savings. The population, in forty years, has doubled; but its earnings and savings have increased nearly fivefold. In 1870, the total wealth of the United States was estimated at thirty billion dollars. In 1911, it was officially estimated at one hundred and thirty billions, or a sum that it would take more than thirteen thousand years to count, at a speed rate of thirty thousand dollars a day.

One might naturally suppose that a people in the prosperous condition shown by these figures would be fairly well satisfied. Mechanics who earn three and a half billion dollars a year, farmers who earn nine billions; and poor people who have four and a half billion dollars in savings-banks, would seem to have little reason for complaint, and still less for finding fault with the government under which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such prosperity has been attained. Strangely enough, however, there seems to be more unrest and discontent in the United States to-day than at any time in recent years. Farmers complain that they are being kept poor by railroads and middle-men; railroad men and industrial workers strike for higher wages, on the ground that their present pay is insufficient; Socialists declare that the rich are growing richer while the poor are getting poorer; Mr. Roosevelt says that we must "have better economic conditions among the mass of our people" in order to escape revolution; and millions of people attack the Government as the power that is most to blame for a state of affairs that is assumed to be intolerable.

The general feeling that there is something wrong with our form of government is widely prevalent; that economic conditions in the United States are bad; that wealth is unequally distributed; that the common people are not getting their equitable share; and that the Government is primarily to blame.

It would not be difficult, perhaps, to show how, in a period of extraordinary and unparalleled prosperity, such a feeling as this has become prevalent. My object, however, in this paper, is not to explain the feeling, but to examine some of the methods by which it is proposed to improve the Government, and thus, presumably, make everybody contented and happy. Three of these methods, which have already been put in practice in many of our States, are known as the initiative, the referendum, and the recall. These measures are properly described as "progressive"; but, from a historical point of view, they should be called "reactionary," because they are a return to much earlier and more primitive methods. In the republics of Greece, in the free Russian cities of Novgorod and Pskof, and in most of the primitive communities whose records have come down to us, the people always legislated directly—generally by means of conventions or mass-meetings. Representative government, that is, legislation through delegates chosen by the people to act for them, is a much later invention. It is now proposed to abandon, in part, the new method, and go back to the old. The people, when they feel like it, are to make laws for themselves, just as they did in mediæval Russia and ancient Greece. They are also to have the right to discharge summarily, without impeach-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment or trial, all of their elected officials, including even their representatives and the judges of their courts. This may be improvement, but it certainly is not progress in the sense of going forward to something new. They had the initiative and the recall in Novgorod the Great—the first Russian Republic—nearly eight hundred years ago; and there the people had power to recall even the Prince whom they had elected to serve as President. They had the initiative and the recall fourteen hundred years ago, in Athens; and there they recalled, among others, such men as Thucydides, Alcibiades, and Pericles. These measures, therefore, are not new; they are centuries old, and they have been abandoned almost everywhere except in Switzerland. Within the past few years, they have been revived in Australasia, and in some of our Western States, and there they are now being tried out again.

If we ask a Direct Ruler what he expects to accomplish by means of these measures, he will probably tell us that he expects to make the government more responsive to the wishes of the people; to break up machine politics and the rule of the bosses; to improve legislation; and, finally, in the words of Mr. Roosevelt, to bring about a "practical betterment of social and economic conditions throughout the land." No one, of course, will deny that these are praiseworthy objects; but it is extremely doubtful whether they can be attained by the methods proposed.

What is the chief defect in our existing machinery of government? If we ask a Direct Ruler this question, he will probably say that the government does not represent the people; that the bosses, the corporations, and the privileged classes have secured control of it, and are using it for their own benefit, regardless of the people's wishes and interests. But even if this be true, who is to blame for it? Is it due to a defect in our form of government, or is it the fault of the people themselves?

Any one who studies the figures of our recent elections must be convinced, I think, that if the people do not rule as fully and completely as they ought to rule, it is because they are too indolent, or too indifferent, to take the necessary trouble. In the primary elections in the State of New York last fall, only fifteen per cent. of the voters went to the polls. In Tioga County there were four thousand two hundred and forty-four voters; but only five hundred and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sixty-one of them took the trouble to vote. In the village of Cortland there were one thousand three hundred and forty-two voters and only one hundred and ninety-seven of them voted. Only ten per cent. of the voters went to the polls in Little Falls; only eight per cent. in Watertown; and only six per cent. in Ilion. How can people expect to rule, or to get good government, when five-sixths of them are so lethargic, or so indifferent, that they will not even go to the polls? The government falls into the hands of the bosses and the machine politicians simply because the people do not do their duty. It may be said that the primary elections, at which only nominations are made, are not important. But they are important. The people cannot expect to have good officials, or good government, unless they make good nominations.

The people, moreover, do not attend properly to their civic duties, even in matters of the utmost importance. In September, 1912, a general election was held in Ohio to vote on thirty-four radical amendments to the State constitution. Most of them were important, and one of them changed the constitutional law of the State with regard to the sale of intoxicating liquor. Less than one-half of the enrolled voters went to the polls, and the number who voted on the liquor-law amendment was only one-third of the total enrollment. The best imaginable form of self-government must necessarily be a failure when, in a great State like Ohio, five or six hundred thousand voters out of a million either decline to vote, or stay away from the polls altogether.

In a Republic like ours, nothing, certainly, can be more important than the choice of a President; and yet, in 1908, when Taft and Bryan were candidates, the number of voters who stayed away from the polls was more than seven million, or about one-third of the entire electorate. Even in the latest election, when Wilson, Roosevelt, and Taft were candidates, and when the popular interest was as great as it is ever likely to be, thirty voters out of every hundred stayed at home on Election day. There were about twenty-one million adult male citizens in the country, but only fifteen million voted. In Ohio last fall, they held a State convention for the purpose of drafting amendments to the State constitution. Only one-quarter of the voters went to the polls and voted for convention delegates. Out

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of thirty-two legislative measures submitted to the people of Oregon at the general election of 1910, not a single one was adopted or rejected by a majority of the enrolled voters. And yet, in the face of such a record as this, the Progressives declare that our form of government must be changed because the people do not rule; but, as the Vice-President has recently said, "The people do rule, as fully as they take the trouble to rule; and when they take more trouble to rule, they will rule more."

One of the principal reasons for the failure of American citizens to vote is indifference. They are not generally interested in public questions that do not directly concern them. In the words of General Bingham, "The average citizen doesn't care until it hits him in his pocket, or in his home —hits him personally." President Taft may have made mistakes as Chief Executive of the nation; but he made no mistake when, four days before the recent election, he said to the students of Harvard, "The real solution of all our political difficulties is to be found in the stimulation of good citizenship. No machinery of any sort, whether by direct primary, referendum, initiative, or recall, will accomplish any real reform, unless the individual citizen himself is stirred to a better performance of his duty as a voter and as a member of his party. If the individual citizen improves his citizenship, then reform will follow, whether new machinery be adopted or not; and if the average standard of good citizenship is not improved, then new political machinery will not aid."

Many clear-sighted students of public affairs have expressed a similar opinion. In a recent address, Raymond B. Fosdick, former Commissioner of Accounts of New York, said that the great remedy for the evils that exist in New York is "personal and individual regeneration. There is no such thing as a civic 'presto change.' Permanent improvement in the quality of the government is dependent upon the quality of the people."

In a speech on the 28th of October last, President Creelman, of the Municipal Civil Service Commission, said: "We cannot carry on government by civil service commission. We must have an intelligent citizenship behind us. . . . What preparation does the voter, who selects the officers that make the policy of the government, make for the high function that he exercises?"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a sermon preached in the Baltimore Cathedral, on the eve of the recent Presidential election, Cardinal Gibbons said: "It is my profound conviction that if ever the Republic is doomed to decay, if the future historian shall ever record the decline and fall of the American Republic, its downfall will be due, not to a hostile invasion, but to the indifference, lethargy, and apostasy of her own sons."

And yet, this indifference of the citizen, which vitally affects the interests, if it does not threaten the very existence, of the Republic, receives no attention whatever in the platform of any political party. All the platforms refer to the rights of the people, but not one to their *duties*. James Bryce, a clear-sighted and sympathetic student of American institutions, has pointed out, in the following words, one of the reasons for this general neglect of civic duty. "The enormous growth of modern States has made the share of the individual citizen seem infinitesimally small. In an average Greek republic, he was one of from two to ten thousand voters. In England or France to-day he is one of many millions. The chance that his vote will make any difference to the result is so slender that it seems negligible."

The Direct Rulers assert that our government is bad because the people do not control it; but the people do not make use of the remedies for existing evils that they already have. What good reason is there to suppose that they will continuously, persistently, and indefatigably make use of the new remedies that are now suggested? So long as such remedies are novel, and so long as the moral and civic enthusiasm that is characteristic of the present time lasts, universal primaries, the initiative, the referendum, the recall, and the various other panaceas that are proposed, will perhaps work well; but when this reform wave passes, when the people get tired, or perhaps disillusioned, and when they begin to neglect their civic duties again, the new machinery will grind out crooked bosses and crooked business just as the old machinery did. The evil-doers are always alert and active, because they live by it. They watch the representative machine constantly and, so far as possible, direct and control it. The people, on the other hand, are at one time in a fever of moral reform, and at another time in a chill of civic indifference. They supervise and direct the political machinery for a while, but then they

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neglect it and the bosses get control. The people—or at least the Progressive people—seem to think now that if they secure universal primaries, the initiative, the referendum, and the recall, good government will come almost automatically; but it will not. The evil-doers will use the new agencies, if the people neglect them, just as they used the old. Mr. J. B. McClure, not long ago, declared that "a successful government must be neglect-proof;" but there is no possibility of making a government neglect-proof. Every human agency must have intelligent and incessant human control, and a neglect-proof government is no more practicable than a neglect-proof steam-engine, or a neglect-proof aeroplane. The price of good government is eternal vigilance, and for eternal vigilance the people of the United States have never yet shown the slightest capacity.

Ex-Attorney-General Wickersham recently suggested that the people be compelled to do their civic duty; that every man who fails to go to the polls and vote be punished. This remedy was tried in ancient Greece, has been tried more recently in Switzerland, and is now being tried in Argentina, but it has never worked satisfactorily. With us it would almost certainly fail, because we cannot control the non-voting citizen, even after we have caught him. You may drag a man to the polls, but if he is indifferent to the question that is submitted to him for judgment, he will deposit a blank ballot. Tens of thousands of voters in our Western States have already done this. In Oregon, it has been found impossible to get a majority vote on one measure out of ten. The threat of punishment may prevent a voter from staying at home, but it will not prevent him from depositing a blank ballot if he takes no interest in the question submitted to him for judgment.

Let us now consider the ability of the people to decide rightly and wisely the great number of measures which the initiative and the referendum will bring before them. Under the present system of government, a law is made by our representatives in the legislature, most of whom are educated or trained men. The proposed law, at first, takes the shape of a bill, which is formally introduced and is then referred to a standing committee. The members of this committee are supposed to be, and generally are, more or less familiar with the subject to which the bill relates. They discuss the bill in detail, and give hearings to all the peo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ple who may happen to be interested in it. After listening to the arguments made for or against it by the people whose interests it affects, they make up their minds about it, and report it back to the House or Senate with a favorable or an unfavorable recommendation. The House or Senate then discusses it again—sometimes at great length—and finally passes it. When it has been acted upon in this way by one House, it goes to the other, where it follows a similar course. It does not finally become a law until it has been considered, debated, and adopted by both Houses. It may be a bad law, even then, but at least it has had deliberate investigation, consideration, and discussion.

Now contrast with this the method of law-making by initiative. In the first place, a bill is drawn up and a canvasser, or "circulator," is paid five, seven, or ten cents a name for getting signatures to it. When a few hundred or a few thousand others have signed it, it goes directly to the people for judgment. It has never been seriously considered or discussed by anybody, and it cannot be changed or amended. It may be partly good and partly bad, or it may come to the voter in such a shape that he cannot vote either "Yes" or "No" without putting himself in a false position. That makes no difference. He must take it as it is, and vote "Yes" or "No" on the question, "Will you take this bill for your law?" If, under these conditions, the bill is approved by a majority of the voters who go to the polls and vote on it, it immediately becomes law. Sometimes, however, only a few voters go to the polls, and in such cases the law is enacted by perhaps not more than one-third of the whole electorate. The majority of the people are then governed by a small minority. In the Oregon election of 1910, nine measures, viz., four constitutional amendments and five statutory laws, were submitted to the people and adopted by them. Not one of the nine received a majority of the total vote cast in the election.* In the Ohio election of September 3, 1912, forty-two measures, including thirty-four constitutional amendments, were submitted to the people for judgment. Less than half the voters of the State took the trouble to vote on them, one way or the other, and the initiative-and-referendum amendment was ratified by only twenty-five per cent of the whole

* Eaton's "Oregon System," p. 161.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

electorate. One-quarter of the people, therefore, legislated for the other three-quarters.

But suppose that all of the voters go to the polls and vote on an initiated bill. What qualifications have they for deciding the questions that the bill presents? In the first place, they are asked to vote, not on one bill, but on twenty, or even forty, at the same time. In Oregon, last year, the people were asked to vote "Yes" or "No" on thirty-eight different bills or constitutional amendments, submitted all together, at a single election. On the same day they were asked to vote for or against more than one hundred different candidates for the various offices. The bills and amendments, with the explanation of them, made a closely printed book of two hundred and sixty pages, and the ballot was as big as a small tablecloth. How many voters read attentively that two-hundred-and-sixty-page book, and looked up the records, or ascertained the characters, of the candidates? Probably not one in a hundred—possibly not one in a thousand. In Pennsylvania, at the same election, the ballot for candidates contained nine columns, and in some of the States the voter had to mark a ticket that was something like six feet in length.

It needs no argument, I think, to prove that the average American voter will not take the trouble to read a book of two hundred and sixty pages, investigate the merits of thirty-eight different laws, look up the records of a hundred candidates, and then go to the polls and, in the words of a Western rhymester, "rassle with a ballot that is six feet over all." He will either shirk the whole business by staying at home, or, if he goes to the polls, will vote only on the few questions that he thinks he knows something about.

The majority of the people have neither the time nor the ability to study complicated questions of governmental policy. They are no more competent to decide them than the stockholders of a railroad would be to decide what type of locomotive should be used, what should be the maximum grade of the track in crossing a divide, what number of new passenger cars should be built every year, and what should be the freight rate on a carload of wheat from Bismarck to Minneapolis. The stockholders elect officers to decide these questions for them, and the officers make it their business to study railway administration and manage

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the property in the best possible way. What would happen to a great corporation like the Pennsylvania Railroad, or the New York Central, if John Jones, a holder of ten shares of stock, could initiate and put through a law changing the classification of freight, regulating the salaries of employees, limiting the amount that might be spent for repairs and betterments, forbidding the erection of new station houses or terminals where they might be needed, or fixing the size and weight of steel rails to be used in replacements or new construction? A railroad so managed would go into bankruptcy in less than five years. But if John Jones, the stockholder, is incapable of managing a railroad, what good reason is there to suppose that John Jones, the voter, has ability enough to run a government?

Thousands of voters in our Western States deposit blank ballots simply because they do not know whether to vote for or against an initiated bill. If I were asked to vote on a proposal to substitute a tunnel for a steep grade, on the track of the Union Pacific Railway where it crosses the Sierra Nevadas, I should probably deposit a blank ballot myself, because I should have no means of knowing whether a tunnel would be better than a steep grade, or a steep grade better than a tunnel. And yet this would be a simple matter as compared with the question whether big trusts be broken up altogether or regulated by a government bureau—a question that might be submitted to me by the initiative or the referendum.

The advocates of direct popular rule say that the people will decide only "fundamental questions," leaving to the legislature the complex or technical details concerning which they—the people—know little or nothing. Waiving, however, the point, which might be made, that the decision of "fundamental questions" often calls for more knowledge and ability than the settlement of details—the history of direct popular legislation shows that the people are not at all disposed to confine themselves to fundamentals. Of the sixty-four questions submitted to the people of Oregon, since the adoption of direct popular government in that State, only twenty-nine, or less than one-half, can possibly be classed as fundamental. The Oregon people, moreover, have shown an increasing disposition to take questions of all kinds away from the legislature and settle them by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

direct popular action. In 1904, only two measures were initiated or presented by referendum. In 1906, the number increased to eleven; in 1908 to eighteen; in 1910 to thirty-two; and in 1912 to thirty-eight. That the people had not knowledge enough to vote wisely on all of these questions is shown by the results in the single-tax case, the courts and judges case, and the case of the Rogue River fisheries.

If any voter will ask himself the question, "Have I knowledge enough to vote wisely on thirty-eight different measures submitted to me at a single election?" he will be forced to admit, I think, that he has not. I myself represent fairly, perhaps, the better informed half of a popular majority, and yet I am not at all sure that I could form a right judgment with regard to dozens of social, political, and economic problems that might be submitted to me under the initiative or the referendum. It is not only possible, but probable, that I, with millions of people like me, might go wrong on really vital questions, simply because I lacked information. Government, in a nation like ours, is a very complicated business, and the people—that is, the majority—have not knowledge enough to vote or act rightly in half the cases that may be presented to them. Popular judgments are as likely to be wrong as are the judgments of individuals. There is no virtue in mere numbers, and the fact that an erroneous opinion is held by an overwhelming popular majority does not make it any less erroneous.

Supporters of the initiative, the referendum, and the recall say that these measures will take the government out of the hands of corrupt or selfish bosses, and put it in the hands of the people where it properly belongs. But will this be the result? It seems to be more than doubtful. The bosses as well as the people can initiate bills and make recalls, and they are far more shrewd and resourceful than the people are in the art of political manipulation. The new machinery, moreover, affords as many opportunities for fraud as the old did. What is to prevent the bosses or the "interests" from initiating bills, hiring corrupt canvassers, and getting thousands of fictitious or fraudulent signatures to their petitions? In Oregon they have already done this. In a judicial investigation of the "spite" referendum on the appropriation for the State university, ten thousand out of thirteen thousand signatures were found to be fictitious or fraudulent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the city of Seattle, last fall, there was an anti-vice crusade, headed by the mayor and aided by a body of special police known as the "Purity Squad." The vicious interests of the city, very naturally, did not like it, and began a popular proceeding to remove the mayor by means of the recall. They offered a recall petition bearing the signatures of twenty-six thousand six hundred alleged citizens, but, upon investigation, all but about eight thousand of the signatures were found to be fraudulent. Meanwhile, a force of seventy-five clerks had spent two weeks in the work of verification.

Then, again, what is to prevent the bosses, or the interests, from framing their bills in such a way as to deceive and mislead the voter? This, also, they have done in Oregon. Four years ago, a bill was initiated there for the purpose of ultimately abolishing all taxes except the tax on land. The people defeated it by a vote of two to one. Two years later the same bill was reintroduced, but in a form which made its object seem to be the abolition of the unpopular poll-tax. The very same people who had defeated the bill in its original form adopted it in its amended form, simply because, in the second election, they were deceived as to its real object. This may happen with any piece of legislation. There seems to be no limit to the devices by which the bosses and the interests control the new machinery for their own purposes. The authorization of the recent constitutional convention in Ohio was apparently secured by means of a "joker" in the printing of the ballots—the words "Constitutional convention; Yes," in small type, being concealed in the middle of a huge blanket ballot, where the voter would not notice them unless his attention were particularly called to them. This joker is supposed to have been contrived by the labor interests, which afterward controlled the convention.

The evils of direct popular rule in Oregon, where it has been on trial for ten years, are summed up by one of its friends as follows:

1. The cost of direct legislation has been high in proportion to the results achieved.

2. The Oregon constitution has been seriously weakened, its safeguards entirely destroyed, and its very existence threatened, by a minority of the voters of the State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. The people have passed laws against their interests and their convictions. They have been fooled by men who claimed to trust the people, but who, afraid to submit measures honestly, so disguised them that they succeeded in passing.

4. The machinery of direct legislation has fallen into the hands of dishonest men, who for money and spite have abused the privilege of direct legislation, and who, in the name of the people, have misrepresented our citizenship and brought disgrace upon our State.*

What we need in the United States is not new political machinery, but a nation of good citizens, who will devote themselves, faithfully and conscientiously, to the duty of choosing good representatives. If the newspaper and magazine writers who, in the past five years, have devoted so much time and space to exposure of the evil deeds of bosses and corporations, had given an equal amount of time and space to the shortcomings of the voters, we might, possibly, have a better government than that which we now see.

No one has set forth more clearly the fundamental defects of direct popular rule than has the distinguished author of *The American Commonwealth*. In a recently published volume entitled *Hindrances to Good Citizenship*, Mr. Bryce says:

"The deficient sense of civic duty, though most frequently noted in the form of a neglect to vote, is really more general and serious in the neglect to think. Were it possible to have statistics to show what percentage of those who vote reflect upon the vote they have to give, there would in no country be found a large percentage. Yet what is the worth of a vote except as the expression of a considered opinion? The citizen owes it to the community to inform himself about the questions submitted to his decision, and to weigh the arguments on each side; or, if the issue be rather one of persons than of policies, to learn all he can regarding the merits of the candidates offered to his choice. But intelligence and independence of thought have not grown in proportion to the diffusion of knowledge. The number of persons who both read and vote, in England and in France, is twenty times as great as it was seventy years ago. The percentage of those who reflect before they vote has not kept pace either with popular education or with the extension of the suffrage. The persons who constitute that percentage are, and for the reasons already given must for some time continue to be, only a fraction — in some countries only a small fraction — of the voting population."

* Allen's "Oregon System," p. 128.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reason why the average voter so often neglects his duty to think and vote is stated by Mr. Bryce as follows:

"A duty shared with many others seems less of a personal duty. If a hundred, a thousand, or ten thousand other citizens are as much bound to speak, vote, or act, as each one of us is, the sense of obligation becomes to each one of us weak. Still weaker does it become when one perceives the neglect of others to do their duty. The need for the good citizen's action, no doubt, then becomes all the greater. But it is only the best sort of citizen that feels it to be greater. The Average Man judges himself by the average standard, and does not see why he should take more trouble than his neighbors. Thus we arrive at the result summed up in the terrible dictum: 'What is Everybody's business is Nobody's business.' . . . The theory of universal suffrage assumes that the Average Citizen is an active, instructed, intelligent ruler of his country. The facts contradict this assumption."

GEORGE KENNAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY I BOUGHT THE EQUITABLE

BY THOMAS F. RYAN

In spite of the many explanations that have been made both by me and on my behalf about the purchase of the shares of the Equitable Life Assurance Society in June, 1905, the question that has since been asked me oftener than any other has related to that particular act. As the term of the trust then created has expired, and, as I no longer bear any relation to the property, it seems to me that I may, perhaps, be justified in giving a somewhat more detailed account of my ownership of it and my reasons for buying it.

No more serious quarrel has disturbed business for a generation than that which rose out of conditions that became known as existing in the Equitable early in 1905. Revelations of one kind or another then began to appear, so that it was for weeks the question upon which newspapers were expected to make a display each day. To outward seeming, this quarrel came out of a clear sky, but as in similar cases, events showed that it had been in preparation for years, and that predictions had long been freely made that some kind of storm was brewing.

It will not be necessary, for the purpose I have in mind, to enter into the details as to the clashing individualities, the many and strong jealousies which combined to foment the trouble. It did not come, however, as the result of machinations by the great financial houses of the Street. In reality, it had only a slight relation to what is familiarly known as Wall Street. In each of the three large life insurance companies which had become a marvel of the time, both as business organizations and as providing the machinery for savings, there were some officials who became jealous either of each other or of those in like positions in rival companies; in other words, it was a fierce incriminating

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quarrel between insiders and those of the smaller and less responsible order. It was almost wholly factional—and the facts fixing this were fully brought forth by the examination of the counsel for the Armstrong Committee, Mr. Charles E. Hughes, later Governor of New York, and now an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court.

It would be as difficult to exaggerate the intensity of this quarrel as it would be to measure its effect upon business. For a time, while a thousand groundless reports were set in motion, the impression was given to the public that the management of great fiduciary institutions, not only of life insurance companies, but of all the corporations or companies or individuals which carried on great business operations, was rotten to the core.

I had taken no part in the management of any insurance company, and had no official relations with them. I was interested in insurance, as I had been from my entrance into business life, but it was as a policyholder, a student and admirer of the development of agencies which had had such a rapid growth and which, at the same time, had so commended themselves to the country as to command public confidence and make their way in almost every country in the world as models of what such institutions should be.

Having therefore no part in these factional differences, recognizing that at bottom they were the result of bitter personal quarrels, and having no interest in any insurance company involved in the resulting troubles, I was of course free from any hampering difficulties in anything I might undertake to do. Naturally, as in the case of other business men, I had large interests that were sure to be affected by any disturbance of the financial situation or by the lack of confidence in the fiduciary institutions of New York, and these interests would be injured by any disaster that might result. I therefore foresaw the danger of a receivership of the Equitable unless the differences in question in the management and among the directors could be overcome. To avert this and to prevent the frightful losses that would occur by the breaking up of such an organization, involving, as it perhaps would, a like fate for other companies, both great and small, in case the contest should go on for a long time, it seemed to me that some one ought to devise a method for meeting the peril that threatened. It appeared to me that it was impossible for men engaged in great American

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enterprises, which depend for their success upon popular confidence, to permit them and the general prosperity to be endangered by a campaign of such destructiveness as that which threatened us.

I could but note, with serious and growing concern, the unseemly contest, the bitterness of which was daily emphasized, and also the indifference to public interest which was manifested by many of the men who, as directors or officials, ought to have been the first to come to the rescue. The public good seemed to be almost entirely forgotten in the desire of most of those on the inside and many others on the outside to take advantage of any mistake that might be made by their opponents, and that their only idea was to make these quarrels serve their own purposes.

In spite of these facts I did not, in the beginning of the contest, feel myself called upon either to throw myself into the breach or to make any attempt to use what resources I might command for composing the trouble. For some time it did not seem possible to me that responsible men would permit really serious conditions to develop, and as I held an entirely independent position, it did not appeal to me as lying within the power of an individual so situated to intervene; but, as the contest became more and more bitter, and as the contestants showed, increasingly, a determination to consider themselves only, thus failing to realize their obligations to the community, the conviction forced itself upon me, that, if others did not come to the rescue, the task, great as it was, might not be beyond my powers. In thinking of this I did not fail to realize what it meant in sacrifice of resources, in risk to fortune and reputation, in misunderstanding and abuse, nor in any of the other penalties that would naturally follow such an act.

But the more I thought of the matter, the clearer it seemed to me that perhaps I might never have a better opportunity to perform a public service than by averting panic and restoring confidence. Although I had no technical knowledge of insurance, it appeared to me plain that if the institutions built up by genius and experience, founded upon the confidence of many millions of saving, prudent individuals, handling together fabulous sums each year, were to be torn to pieces by passion and faction, then our whole scheme of business, whether it related to transportation, banking, manufacturing or mining, would receive a shock from which it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would recover only after many years of loss and suffering.

In many respects, so far as I was concerned, the crisis came at an important period of my life. I had been engaged for many years in organizing and carrying on, so far as my powers and resources permitted, large business schemes and enterprises. They had taken all my energies and had left me practically no time for doing those things which it seemed to me more and more incumbent upon every man to do, at some time, if he has been the recipient of anything like an average share of prosperity. I felt that a man's success in this country was to be judged mainly by what he did, and the more I thought of it the more I was convinced that this was something worth doing.

Moreover, I had reached a time of life and a position in the business world which led me to contemplate retirement from its grinding activities. I had long had in mind many things that I wanted to do, and not one of them had borne any relation to a desire to make more money or to add to the fortune I had already accumulated. It occurred to me that I might even make this practically the culminating point of my active career. I knew perfectly that, whatever might be the sentiment of others toward me or toward the act I contemplated, what I intended would be a real service, and that whatever of misunderstanding might result, the end would show that I had acted unselfishly.

When this idea presented itself to my mind in concrete form I had made arrangements to visit Kentucky, for the double purpose of resting and purchasing stock for my Virginia farm. Thus remote from the scenes of activity and struggle, away from news and financial gossip, free from all interruption and yet cognizant of all the underlying conditions in the problem that presented itself, I could look over the whole situation much more critically than if I were on the ground. The matter was too delicate to be discussed with anybody, and, besides, as it finally presented itself to me, it did not concern any one else. It seemed to be my task. In the beginning I had thought that perhaps I would need financial co-operation, but when I looked about I found that two difficulties presented themselves in this respect. It became clear that if I limited my associates to those who, like myself, were only desirous of doing a public service, both the number and the amount of the contributions they could make were too small to be of vital assistance; if, on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other hand, I accepted the offers of one or two men who wanted to participate, I was in danger of being overwhelmed not only with advice, which I would not take, but with an assistance which would have hampered me in every movement.

I returned to New York without reaching any definite conclusion but still deeply impressed with the necessity for action. But the whole question had taken possession of me, and so I went to my Virginia farm where, still without advisers, I could again concentrate my attention upon the matter that had been of absorbing interest to me. It was there and then that I finally saw my way clear to take up the task, still leaving unimportant details out of account.

From the beginning I had no other idea than that of purchasing the stock control of the Equitable at such a price as I must pay, and of placing it at once in the hands of Trustees, of whom ex-President Grover Cleveland was to be one—and, naturally, the Chairman—and also of doing this only upon such terms as should immediately divest me of all control over the stock, and of detail management of the Society itself. I had determined to do these things with the one condition that, so far as the laws permitted, the management of the Society should be turned over to a majority of directors to be chosen by the policyholders, from their own numbers.

I had long been an admirer of Mr. Cleveland and, by reason of personal and political affiliations, had come into close relations with him. Knowing that I had no ambitions, he had often asked my advice and assistance, mainly in matters relating to currency and coinage. Thus, in perfect accord with his aims, whether partisan or patriotic, cognizant of his unrivaled position in the country, I had also noted, with sorrow, that he was hampered by lack of means to maintain the dignity of a man who had twice filled with such distinction the Presidency of the United States. I visited him in Princeton soon after his removal there and noticed with great concern this fact, which was confirmed by himself and further emphasized by friends who knew him even better than I did. It seemed to me that he ought to be removed from the necessity of doing literary work of the kind in which he was engaged in order to obtain the money necessary for keeping himself and family in the position that he felt incumbent upon him. I soon found that schemes,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ranging from the management of a winter hotel to the presidency of a trust company, had been suggested for him, but none of them, unworthy as they were, came to anything. I then resolved and announced, especially to one friend, that I would, at some time, make an opportunity to bring about the desired result. But the only condition that I fixed in this was that the solution of the difficulty must be one which would bring no profit to me in any form and should at the same time enable the former President to do some public service really worthy of his position and character.

Further, I felt that the creation of an Equitable Trust, with Mr. Cleveland at its head, would meet the idea I had in mind, both so far as it related to him, and at the same time enable me, even without his knowledge, to do a great service to the country. It would solidify the new appreciation of him which had begun to come back about this time, and, best of all, it would save our financial institutions by restoring confidence. No business proposal of any kind was ever made to him by me or any one acting for me from the beginning until his relations to the trusteeship were ended by death. When the preliminaries were complete, an intimate friend of my own and of the former President was intrusted with the presentation of the matter. The rest of the story is well known. My letter to Mr. Cleveland and his remarkable answer to it have become a part of the financial history of the time. I did not deem it necessary, so far as the public was concerned, to do more than write to Mr. Cleveland in answer to his letter anything more than a formal note of thanks, but privately I went further and wrote him the following letter which was the only thing in the way of instructions from me that ever reached him or any member of the Board of Trustees or of the trustees as a body:

"NEW YORK, *June 12, 1905.*

"*Hon. Grover Cleveland, Princeton, New Jersey—*

"Permit me to thank you for your letter of the 10th inst., confirming your acceptance of the trusteeship of the Equitable Life Assurance Society which it was my privilege to tender to you. From the beginning and throughout the negotiations which accompanied the purchase of the majority holdings of this great fiduciary institution, it has been my constant purpose to ask you to undertake this duty.

"I should never have consented, for a moment, even to entertain the thought of participating in this important and culminating work if I had not held and emphasized at every point the ideas which I knew would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

move you, or had I not been attached, both as a business man and as an American, to those policies which have been the guiding purposes of your life in every relation that you have borne to your countrymen.

"You emphasize and express my own convictions and determination when you insist that the time has come when, as a people and as individuals, we must consider the quality of our material growth and development. We can no longer look merely to size, or to quantity, or even to the world-wide extension of our commercial power. We must have progress, but it must be on true lines, or we shall pay too dearly for it. Our democratic institutions, our enterprises, and the efficiency of our labor fit us to go out into the world and to compete in every line of human effort; but we cannot do this if we lose sight of the fact that no permanent success is possible if we forget moral obligations or duties.

"I welcome your assurance that you will demand, as I knew you would, the most rigorous responsibility on the part of all concerned, and that your scrutiny of men and methods will be based upon the highest and most exacting standards. I note, too, your insistence that the great army of policyholders of the Equitable Life Assurance Society shall be the supreme consideration. They and the uncounted millions who stand behind them, not only in life insurance companies, but in all other institutions for the encouragement of thrift, must be made not only to feel but to know of a truth that their interests, lying as they do at the very foundation of our growth and prosperity, are the most important that can be confided to men.

"I remain,

"Very truly yours,

"THOMAS F. RYAN."

The announcement of the appointment of the trustees acted like magic upon the unwholesome business conditions prevailing at the time. From their first meeting—the only one I ever attended in order to execute the deed of trust—accompanied by the issue of a formal address, followed by the first list of directors chosen by them, confidence asserted itself. Sensational reports disappeared and even the threat of danger—much less danger itself—was no longer powerful. Mr. Cleveland's action thus taken, added to the prestige of a great name, had entirely cleared the air in a moment.

Nor was I less concerned as to whom should be associated with Mr. Cleveland than in his own appointment and acceptance. From my earliest days in New York I had been thrown into close and friendly association with Morgan J. O'Brien, then a Justice of the Supreme Court in the State of New York. I had watched with admiration his sure and steady rise to power and influence, and how at every turn he had been able to command, as he deserved, the good will of his friends and of the general public. I knew his quali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties as a business man as well as those which distinguished him as a lawyer and judge. I had not employed him in cases in which I was interested—which left both of us in an entirely independent position—all of which, to my mind, made it exceedingly important that, if possible, I should secure his services as a member of the Board of Trustees. It was with difficulty that he was induced to accept because he was then burdened with heavy tasks in philanthropic, charitable and religious causes, in addition to his work on the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court.

For the third member of the Board I was especially desirous of finding a business man whose name, being a household word, would appeal to the imagination of the country as one who, under any and all circumstances, would do his duty to the public. For this reason I chose the third member, George Westinghouse. My own acquaintance with him was not close, but this was all the more reason why I should choose such a man for an important post like this. I was determined that every member of the Board should be as far removed as possible from any obligation to myself, and I do not think that in either of the cases mentioned I could have made a better choice, one which would have justified itself better in the eyes of my countrymen.

I do not believe there is another case in our history in which quiet and orderly business has again asserted itself so quickly, after such a long and serious disturbance, as in the case of the Equitable Society in June, 1905. In confirmation of this fact, Mr. Cleveland insisted, to the end, that he looked upon this work as perhaps the most important and certainly the most gratifying that he had done during his entire public career.

When I had resolved upon this action and had taken the preliminary step to get the price of the stock, divesting myself of any control of it, selecting trustees who would strike the public imagination, other matters quite as important were to be considered. Among these the most vital was that of getting the right man at the head of the Society as its executive officer, one who would not only work in perfect harmony with the trustees, but would carry out my own ideas to the letter. Some time previously I had met Paul Morton, then Secretary of the Navy in the Cabinet of President Roosevelt. He was practically a stranger to me. I had known his father very well both as a public official and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a man of the highest character. My original proposition to Mr. Morton on business had been made with no relation whatever to the Equitable, or to any thought of it; but after I had thought out the details as narrated, it struck me at once that here was the man who, if he could be transferred from the other activities in which I had intended to engage him, would work it out as completely as possible. When I had perfected all my plans in my own mind, and all the legal complications had been studied and mastered, I made it a condition of the purchase of the control of the Equitable from Mr. Hyde that Mr. Morton should be elected president of the Society, and that he should be vested with the most ample powers over the old Board; in fact, it was a part of my plan that every official of the Society and every member of the Board should place his resignation in the hands of the new president.

After this preliminary work had been done, the rest was comparatively easy. Confidence was at once restored in the way that I have noted, and from that moment practically all danger of panic disappeared not only so far as the insurance companies were concerned, but from every branch of financial activity.

I have already said that I had had practically no personal relations with Mr. Morton before I had chosen him for this important work, but never in all my long and extensive business experience has such a choice been better justified. He had excellent personal relations with Mr. Cleveland by reason of the latter's political association with his father and his great confidence in him. Mr. Morton himself soon showed not only that he had a large and comprehensive idea of the immediate work to be done in the matter of perfect restoration of confidence, but, though without any technical knowledge of insurance, he at once took hold of the routine work and reorganization in the most effective way. His choice of men to help him proved itself to be excellent in every way; his relations with the old and experienced members of the Board who remained in the service soon demonstrated that he had no narrow plans and that he made no pretense whatever to know everything about the routine of an important and difficult business. He at once turned over all the resources of the Society to the trustees. In the rigorous investigation which the trustees felt themselves called upon to make about the policyholders

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whose names were suggested as fitting directors of the Society, he co-operated to his full power; but he did not once intervene or make suggestions to them in any way that either was or looked like interference. There was no sign of jealousy, assertiveness, or narrowness in his methods. As the trustees proceeded to fill up the Board of Directors Mr. Morton developed in as high a degree as I have ever seen exhibited anywhere the faculty of putting himself in touch with his Board and really leading it. He studied each man individually, and found out not only what he thought ought to be done but what he himself would like to do, not only what he was thinking of, but what he was capable of doing. It took only a few weeks, therefore, for him to command the absolute confidence of his Board, and from the day that this was done and until the end of his life, nearly six years later, this confidence continued.

He showed a keen appreciation of what ought to be done from the point of view of management and in the way of expenditures. He did not undertake to go in and hit right and left without any regard for the interest of individuals—whether officials in the Society, or agents, or anybody in the vast army of people who depended upon its activities for their living and upon whom it was largely dependent for its business and its success. He did not yield to public clamor, or unduly hurry himself in carrying out any policies which he and the Board had in mind.

At the end of the first year of his management he was able to assure the public that he had reduced the executive expenses by more than a million dollars, or about twenty to twenty-five per cent. over the previous year. He had examinations made by trained accountants so that he himself soon knew the exact condition of the business in all its parts. Keen, cool-headed, straightforward in his methods and in everything he did, the debt which insurance—not the Equitable alone but the business itself as a business—owes to Mr. Morton can hardly be estimated; and when the history of insurance development during the past years is written his place in it cannot be other than a striking and creditable one.

My own relation to the Equitable after I had purchased the stock was simple. I had taken this great risk, and had deprived myself of the use in my business of a very large sum of money, as well as the right to exercise any control

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over either the trustees or the management of the Society itself. The trustees pursued their own course. They took up the work with a great deal of energy, a fact, as has already been set forth historically, so far as it related to Mr. Cleveland, whose spirit was also infused throughout the whole Society.

Within a month after the trustees had taken charge, a new Finance Committee, chosen by the trustees, took up its work. It abandoned investments, accepted new ones, made loans, bought securities, and conducted business in its own way.

The stock certificate for the 502 shares, the controlling interest, was put into the hands of the secretary of the trustees and was kept, I have been informed, in a safe-deposit vault during the five-year term of the trust. I never saw it and do not, even to this day, know where it was kept. The semi-annual dividends were drawn to the order of the trustees, in whose name the stock stood, and in accordance with the trust agreement were indorsed over to my order. The trustees were a self-perpetuating body and could renew the trust by five-year periods without any consultation with me or my representatives until the end of time if they had elected to do so. From the beginning, as I made plain in my letter to Mr. Morton, June 26th, 1905, I had no idea of the resale of the securities. I did, however, at that time, and by the advice of the trustees, give an additional assurance to them and to the public that the Society might purchase the stock at any time without any profit to me.

Outside of my letter to the trustees that the business of the Society should be conducted upon the highest lines, I had, as noted, made one pledge in the letter appointing them, that the Society, so far as the law permitted, should be made a mutual insurance company to be under the control of the policyholders. I believed this to be right and so imposed the condition that permanent provision should be made from the beginning for the election by the policyholders of twenty-eight directors, two more than a majority. I soon learned that Mr. Cleveland was so strongly opposed to this policy that he hesitated to take the steps necessary for carrying into effect my express wishes. He was so settled in his convictions that in the hope of overcoming my insistence he asked for an interview. I was soon able to convince him that I looked upon any failure to carry out this policy as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

breach of faith. Another trustee was still more reluctant to surrender his convictions. I used the same arguments and assurances with him, and in response to these the policy was carried through without further opposition from the trustees. This is the only case even remotely resembling interference with those gentlemen during the years of the continuance of the trust in my name.

I am free to confess that some semblance of support was given to the trustees in the attitude which the policyholders then took. During the first year appeal was made to the policyholders, with the result that over 90,000, just more than one-fourth, responded in some sort of way either with a proxy or voted direct for some trustee suggested by themselves. No attempt whatever was made to influence the policyholders for or against any individual policy, but this activity was a mere spurt, as the interest on their part seemed to be lost from that time forward, so that it was difficult in the following year to gather about forty voters for the annual meeting, and I have been told that in following years the number has still further declined. While this proved that the trustees reflected the real mind of the policyholders, it made no impression upon me. Instead of weakening my belief in mutualization this but strengthened it, because, as I looked at the matter, this control was not only just and proper, but it removed everything resembling a grievance and confirmed the belief that the choice of directors through disinterested trustees was the natural solution of many of the problems to be found in modern corporate management.

Mr. Cleveland had a very strong feeling of resentment toward the men who, having been directors of the Equitable, ran away when their help was most needed. One of the things that he told me, before actively taking hold of the work in the single interview I had with him, was that he would never consent that any of these men should be permitted to come back as directors, and he and the trustees adhered to this policy with a rigidity that nothing could shake. I need scarcely say that in this I concurred. It seemed to me unnatural that at such a time and under such conditions men should run away from what was one of the most conspicuous and important of their duties to the great trust which had been reposed in them.

The only complaint that ever came to me from the trus-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tees or officials of the Society or from any other source was based upon my refusal to give instructions. I had neglected what they termed my own interests, but they went their own way as absolute owners of the property. That I had done right to myself and my own was apparent and there appeared to be no reason why I should further concern myself with the management, unless the trustees, in the exercise of their power, should at the end of the term for which they had been chosen throw it back into my hands.

I should not like, however, to convey the impression that my attitude was one of careless indifference. No man could have watched with more interest and pride the progress of the Society. It was a pleasure to see how confidence in good management so speedily replaced the wild accusations, the suspicions, and the unrest that had characterized the insurance business for nearly a year. Even the laws which followed, some of which seemed drastic in their features, were soon to demonstrate their failure and to disappear, a conclusion that has amply justified itself.

All the reports which were made as a result of the investigations of the Equitable, so far as they contained practical recommendations, had been substantially anticipated by Mr. Morton. Those that had been made before the appointment of the trustees, both by Mr. Hendricks, then Commissioner of Insurance, and by the Frick Committee, at once became so many idle words. Mr. Cleveland's name and Mr. Morton's work soon restored confidence and corrected the evils that had provoked the scandal.

This conclusion not only applied to the Equitable, but the other companies engaged in the business, whether they were large or small, shared in the benefits. Every one of them was soon reorganized, careless men were eliminated from the directorates and, gradually and surely, the business came back to a reasonable and solid prosperity. Whatever abuses had existed were corrected and it is not unfair to claim that this was the natural effect of the immediate restoration of confidence following as a result of the coming of Mr. Cleveland and his associates into the trusteeship of the Equitable, accompanied, as it was, by the safe and prudent management of Mr. Morton.

Not least among the things that I pride myself upon in the Equitable matter is the determination of myself and of Mr. Cleveland, faithfully and vigorously carried out by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Morton, that the Equitable should once and for all be taken out of and kept out of politics. Prior to that time the large insurance companies were in politics, had made contributions to political campaigns, and had paid large sums to legislative agents in various States—all no doubt in what their officers believed to be to the best interest of their policyholders or for their protection. Mr. Cleveland and I determined that this should cease. We resolved that if legislation were introduced or proposed that was hurtful to the best interests of the Society or its policyholders, it should oppose it on its merits only and in the open, and by the authority of the directors of the Society, and that if harmful or ill-considered legislation were enacted the Society would have to endure it until its effects should be demonstrated and upon reconsideration more just or equitable provisions be enacted. This policy was vigorously carried out, and I am firmly convinced that it has done more by its example to leave unhampered great business enterprises and free them from dangerous political control than any other one act has done in our time. It is an old adage that actions speak louder than words, and I have always believed that deeds and not declarations are what men should be judged by.

I reached the conclusion, reinforced by study and observation, that most Boards of Directors are at once too large in number and too irresponsible. I am convinced that the Equitable, for instance, with its vast interests, should be managed by a Board of not more than thirteen members. Nominated, as now, by trustees, from the whole body; selected with direct reference both to the details to be mastered and for demonstrated ability to comprehend and administer large affairs; paid liberally, though not lavishly, for the time given to the work; required to know and understand every act of the Board; and held to strict account, such men would both command and deserve the confidence of stockholders and the public. Corporate management would thus escape from the one-man power which is now its peril, while the big man, whose only claim to recognition is his investment, or his connection, and not of necessity his honesty and ability, might gradually be eliminated.

I am also further confirmed in the belief that a comprehensive publicity in great business concerns is one of the necessities of the future. By this, I do not refer merely to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accounts or financial estimates, which, in many quarters—especially among politicians—seem to pass for this process. I mean, rather, a discussion of the essential methods and elements of business which shall set forth how and why things are done, give currency to changes when they have justified themselves, explain how the conditions of industry are constantly changing, emphasize the fact that combination, in its final analysis, is nothing but intelligent and honest co-operation, and show how the modern exchange of products is governed by conditions and laws which only require knowledge to assure popular sympathy, reduce misunderstanding to its lowest terms, and prevent the losses incident to agitations, which are too often based upon ignorance.

At no time did I ever contemplate even the possibility of making myself a financial power separate and apart from any of the existing machinery of business. I had no desire for leadership because, as I have already said, I was preparing to escape from exacting work as soon as possible in order to devote my time to other things. I was also determined that there should not be even the smallest excuse for any attempts to connect any venture of mine with the ownership of the Equitable stock. During the time that I owned the Equitable stock I never borrowed a dollar of the Society, never sold to it a bond or a share of stock, and was never pecuniarily interested directly or indirectly in any of its financial transactions, large or small.

It had been my good fortune to enter upon the large activities of business at a time, about 1880, that the country needed every effort that could be put forth by men who had been trained for large affairs. The growth had been so rapid, the increase in population had gone on at such a rate, the changes incident to new methods, to the applications of science to industry, to the co-operation of direction and capital, and to the relations they bore to labor, had been so marked, that everything of a business character made demands upon men which it was almost impossible to satisfy. As a result of the war with Spain and many other influences, both economic and political, the country had assumed a new position in the world. Its people had to take new and larger views than had ever been necessary, and the results have been far-reaching.

I am convinced that no man can participate in large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activities without doing a public service. There is almost inevitably a dearth of men of experience and foresight. The demands are so large that scarcely any man who finds himself in the midst of such a condition, where he must bend all his energies to his task, can fail to accumulate something for himself.

There is a mistaken idea abroad as to the accumulation of fortunes. It seems to be generally thought that these come suddenly, in great amounts, whereas they are more akin to the process represented by the miller's toll for grinding wheat into flour. Accumulation comes slowly but surely if management is prudent and far-seeing. Without making a special study of the times since 1880 to the present no man can have any idea of the work that has been done, of the increase in popular wealth and prosperity, or of the large number of men, very widely distributed over the country, who, in their particular fields, have contributed to this result on creative lines.

The growth of business has made necessary the adoption of co-operative methods so that probably no great transaction has been carried on within the last twenty years in which the leading banks all over the United States have not been called upon to take their share of risk and, in the case of success, their share of profit. But the division of these profits has in many cases been minute, and, on the other hand, men outside these activities can hardly have any conception of the risks involved in great ventures like these. There seems to be a general feeling that everything that is taken up must succeed in spite of the fact that this is not the rule even in the simplest affairs of life.

This false popular idea has had much to do with the creation of the feeling that there was somewhere a great combination or money trust. There has been gross exaggeration about the supposed control, of any given property or any groups of property, accruing to bankers by participation in projects, new or old. For instance, I recall that when I purchased the Equitable stock, one of the common assertions was that I had come into control of so many hundreds of millions of dollars, when the truth was that, in this particular case, I had no control at all, and even if I had owned every share of the stock and had been the absolute manager, I should not have been able, under any circumstances, to use any considerable proportion of the funds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Society in a way that could have served my own purposes. The investments of fiduciary agencies are a steady quantity with only slight changes, and in the case of insurance companies, as with savings-banks and national banks, the conditions are rigidly fixed by law. They are managed by strong, responsible committees in each organization, and I have yet to see such a body that would consent to put itself under the control of a single banker or even a group of bankers. The banker may be the fiscal agent of a corporation or a railroad and yet be able to exercise only the smallest control and sometimes none at all. He represents a fixed policy to which he must adjust himself, and as he is paid for each particular transaction, his clients may find another representative the next day.

So far as the Equitable is concerned, I am much indebted to the disinterested labors of the trustees to whom I turned for assistance, to the officials of the Society, and to the able men who, in the face of many difficulties and discouragements, consented to enter the Board of Directors. But, if my indebtedness to these men is great, the obligation of the public, whose interest they conserved, is beyond computation.

Without even emphasizing my own relations to this work I have always had what I think is a just pride in feeling that the Society and the business it represented was at once taken out of politics and of what was known as Wall Street. I had naturally foreseen the storm of denunciation, the questioning of motives, and the abuse that would come to me from many quarters, as indeed it did, but I was never moved by it to make an answer, because I felt that, as my motives were so clear to myself, they would become so to the public when time should justify me, as it must. I could afford to wait and I have waited with the feeling that, in doing what I deemed a commanding act, at the opportune moment, I should become understood. I have even thought that, perhaps, my act might come to be appreciated as something of a service rendered by me to the world on my way through it.

THOMAS F. RYAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NATIONAL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY

BY A. F. ZAHM

THERE is in America a spontaneous movement, amply justified by present conditions, to marshal all our resources in aeronautics to the more systematic and scientific development of that fascinating, but as yet too deadly, mechanical art. For it is broadly appreciated that the adequate achievement of a system of locomotion so swift, so direct and universal, is abundantly worth the labor of a skilled army of men toiling unremittingly, if need be, through the entire twentieth century. And it is keenly realized that if this populous and wealthy nation, which has contributed nothing to the evolution of the buoyant air-ship, is to sustain in aviation a fair measure of the pre-eminence gained by her pioneers in aerodynamic research, and in the construction of aeroplanes and flying-boats, she must, even in these limited branches, wisely co-ordinate her best efforts and most effective agencies.

That pleasant pre-eminence has not only to be sustained; it has too patently, too largely to be retrieved. In aerodynamics our investigators once led the world; now, for want of endowment, they make only the feeblest progress. America produced the first steam and the first gasolene models capable of sustained flight; she invented and built the first passenger monoplanes and biplanes of adequate stability and power for prolonged voyages; yet to-day she stands before the world stripped of every first-class record coveted anywhere by the votaries of aviation. The records for speed, for distance, for altitude, for endurance, for swift climbing, for useful load, all have passed from the clever pioneer to the more systematic and zealous com-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

petitor.* At the annual Olympic of aviation the grand trophy has been taken thrice consecutively by a French monoplane; and now the victor nation defies us to win back that coveted honor within three years' time by use of an American-built machine.

This very honorable challenge cannot, without deep humiliation, be ignored or lightly laughed away. We established that unique trophy, perhaps the most famous in tournamental history, and we also, in large measure, created the fantastic art of racing swallow-like through the fields of air. But this friendly appeal to our sportive and scientific skill is the least incentive to concerted action. Our own sense of the intrinsic value of aviation for civil use and for the national defense, and our native bent for hard and daring enterprise of epochal moment prompt us to the most virile effort and most rational co-ordination of forces. Our statesmen, therefore, and strategists, our opulent patrons of science, our engineers and constructors, our adroitest aviators, may well co-operate in the organized promotion of aeronautic science and art.

Of these various motives for solid team-work, the sportive one, though not less laudable than our ancient ardor to flag the poles, may be dismissed with kindly commendation. A lively emulation, however, in aeronautic science, a wise and sturdy strife for leadership, in the interest of human progress, cannot be too much encouraged in a huge commonwealth so beneficently dowered with the essential resources for advancing empiric knowledge. True, this is an appeal to sentiment. Our shrewd and practical opportunists advise delay till other nations shall have evolved an air-ship suitable for commercial exploitation. But is not this a trader's counsel which, if everywhere adopted, would stop the fundamental progress of the world? Fortunately the liberal and large American philanthropist is swayed not wholly by commercial predilections, and is no more keen to

* The present record for speed is 108¾ miles per hour in a closed circuit; for distance, 628 miles without stop; for altitude, 19,685 feet; for duration, 13 hours 18 minutes; for fast climbing nearly 500 feet per minute (1,640 feet in 3′ 35″); all records won by French pilots with French aeroplanes.

The most notable American record is that of Lieutenant John Towers in a Curtiss hydroaeroplane lasting 6 hours 10 minutes continuously. The 4,017 mile flight of C. P. Rodgers from New York to Pasadena was too broken and too protracted to have any technical significance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foster the practical arts than to endow the basic sciences from which they spring.

If aeronautics could serve no other use than national protection its military value alone should claim our most careful attention. As an agency in strategic and tactical operations, not to mention the transportation of officers, troops, or supplies, it now ranks as the fourth arm of the greatest military establishments in the world. Already France's annual expenditure for this branch rapidly approximates the cost of a first-class battle-ship. And in this she is stoutly rivaled by Germany, and bravely emulated by Russia and Italy. Nor does there seem to be any hope of relief or escape from this new burden. On the contrary, in a contest of two well-matched powers command of the air may be but the prelude to domination by land or sea. No wonder the alert military states are diligently arming their avions and auto-balloons in anticipation of aggressive aerial warfare and of inevitable conflicts in the sky.

It is, however, the civil uses of aeronautics which may eventually far outvalue its military applications. Our present air craft have even now many of the essential qualities of a complete system of world navigation. In less than half a decade the auto-balloon has been transformed from a comparatively feeble and uncertain ship, battling its way against the wind, with all too frequent mishaps, into a powerful air liner carrying numerous passengers on schedule time. In Germany, Count Zeppelin's great rigid dirigible, the "Victoria Louise," launched in February, 1912, has been making regular voyages of ten to twenty hours, and carrying in snug accommodation upward of thirty passengers. These happy tourists, voyaging in stately splendor and admirable security, are borne through the sky at railway speeds, furnished with the finest parlor and café service of a modern palace-car. But these journeys form the merest beginning of a practical business in buoyant air navigation. The Zeppelin Company has been considering plans for a liner one thousand feet long, adapted to carry three hundred passengers at upward of fifty miles an hour, and competent to cross the Atlantic in three days. The famous inventor, Count Zeppelin, has made some calculations to prove that his passenger air-ships may be expected to pay good dividends in competition with established systems of trans-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portation. Nor is the Zeppelin Company the only one in Europe that operates a successful air-ship line.

The aeroplanes, too, despite their fatalities and transient loss of prestige, require little development, except in their engines, to adapt them to important industrial uses. A cheap-running reliable motor will enable them to compete for interurban traffic effectively with the automobile and the power-boat. In many respects they already equal or excel these popular vehicles of land and water. In their better types, they sweep from capital to capital with twice the speed of the eagle; they overtop the clouds and loftiest passes of Alps or Andes; they remain on the wing all day; they navigate in direct line over land and sea; over tracts impassable to any but aerial craft they carry the burden of an automobile with many times its average velocity. And in safety of transit may they not eventually surpass all the other high-speed contrivances known to man? At least this consummation is predicted by many inventors of first-rate ability.*

Prompted by the foregoing or like considerations, the friends of aeronautics in America are striving to secure for it a patronage and means of development commensurate with that which it enjoys in the great commonwealths of Europe. The Aero Club of America, with the indorsement of various scientific and technical organizations, has pledged itself to secure the endowment of a national aeronautical laboratory. The expediency of a broader and more generous encouragement of aerial navigation in all its branches, but especially as a means of national defense, has been favorably discussed in Congress preparatory to definite legislation. The aviation branches of the United States Army and Navy, though with limited resources, have been actively employed not only in training aviators, but also in testing the military value of

* Bleriot has expressed his conviction that the aeroplane will be generally adopted for moving swiftly and pleasantly from place to place, that it will be extremely safe, while swifter and cheaper than any other known vehicle of land or sea. "There is," he says, "absolutely nothing to prevent flight from becoming one of the greatest developments in the world's history."

At the Curtiss school during the past year a score to threescore flights have been made daily in all but the severest weather, and without serious accident. The running expense has been about the same as with an automobile of the same power.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the best available air craft and appliances. Their influence in bestirring manufacturers to meet more and more difficult requirements as to speed, endurance, climbing and carrying power, structural strength, efficiency, and whatever other qualities may be important in the military art, has been most beneficial. The final task, now fairly begun, is to coordinate these agencies by means of an organic general directorate, then to secure the requisite funds for the scientific and practical development of aeronautics in America. This financial assistance may be obtained either from Congress or by direct appeal to the people, as has been done so successfully in Europe; or through the munificence of zealous patrons who, emulating their sagacious peers in Russia, France, and Germany, may establish well-equipped laboratories for general service, and offer adequate remuneration or liberal awards for meritorious achievement in aero science or in the production or manipulation of aerial machines and appliances.

These separate phases of the general movement deserve more detailed exposition. But, for the presnt, only the effort to found a laboratory can have due consideration.

The national aerotechnical institution proposed by the Aero Club of America, and strongly advocated in its official bulletin, as in other progressive periodicals, is needed to furnish the basic facts and principles of aeronautic engineering, and such theoretic and empiric knowledge as may be useful to all promoters of the flying art. The inventors and builders in this country feel keenly the want of experimental data to form a rational basis for their structural designs; the users and students of air craft experience equally a want of adequate and disinterested tests of existing aeroplanes and their accessories.

The designing draughtsman poring over the plans for a novel flier, and loath to assign its shape and proportions by mere intuition or conjecture; the bewildered capitalist; the constructor and experimentalist disappointed in the output of their machine, designed without sufficient mechanical data; the Federal officers drawing specifications for requisite avions and searching in French, German, or Italian literature for information, charily disclosed, when not positively withheld, by foreign Governments, our aero clubmen, at great expense in time and money, striving with admirable sportsmanship and patriotism, by means of trophies, tourna-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments, and cash awards, to improve all the important records of our aerial machines; the general public, horrified by the long list of avoidable fatalities due to inadequate provision for strength or stability—all have experienced the intense common desire for a more systematic and rational development of an art which can never be obliterated, but which, adequately developed and sensibly employed, may become a benefaction instead of a pernicious plague. There is, therefore, a general desire for an American institute that shall supply these wants in the broadest and most thorough manner, an institute not for training aviators or instructing engineers, for this is already done in several schools, but primarily for the increase and diffusion of aeronautical science. Only by means of such an establishment, and by the mutual aid and co-operation of all our votaries of the flying art, may we hope to keep pace with the progress, so conspicuous in foreign countries, in improving the security and capacity of aerial machines.

If the laboratory is to be broadly national it must subserve both civilian and military interests. If supported by Federal appropriations alone, it may be placed entirely in one of the regular bureaus of the Government; but if, like the National Museum, it is to be the recipient of private donations of equipment or money, it may very properly be made a branch of the Smithsonian Institution. This affiliation appeals to more than sentiment alone, however worthy; for the Smithsonian, besides its renown in aviation, already has a considerable nucleus of aeronautic apparatus, models, books, and so forth, and an endowment fund of one hundred thousand dollars for investigation of the properties of the air. But whether the laboratory be established by private means or governmental, or both, what our people require is a representative American institution in which a staff of trained specialists, provided with adequate apparatus, shall furnish physical constants, laws, formulæ, and empirical data of substantial and permanent value to the engineer, the inventor, and the manufacturer; a laboratory where complete and reliable tests and reports shall be made upon all classes of actual air craft that may be worthy of study and development; an institution surrounded by ample manœuvering space of land and water, and preferably adjacent to a governmental flying-ground, available with hangars and shops to all civilians worthy of assistance; a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

center of scientific and practical activity, where at all times may be witnessed the most accurate researches and most exhaustive tests; where the knowledge so gained shall be disseminated by publications, by oral communications, by exhibitions of apparatus and instruments, of materials and models, by photographs and drawings—in a word, by all the facilities of the aerodrome, the showroom, the library, and the assembly-room.

This general conception of America's need in aerotechnical science has been for several years firmly maturing in the minds of all her votaries of aerial locomotion alert to the progress of this unique branch of engineering. Happily the general desire and the spontaneous movement for an adequate center of aerotechnical activity have been expressed in a specific working plan, submitted to his chief, by Captain W. I. Chambers, the officer in charge of aviation in the United States Navy. The approval and publication of this plan now brings before the American people a definite and practical ideal, of ample scope and liberality to serve both the needs of industrial and military aeronautics and the more rigorous demands of exact engineering science; an ideal that, less concretely, has been voiced many times in editorial comments, in the committees of aero clubs and scientific societies, and in the councils of various military and civil bureaus of the Federal Government. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the timely proposition of the Navy Department will, at least in its main features, meet with universal commendation and active support.

Captain Chambers proposes the establishment of a national aerodynamic laboratory having, besides many important concrete qualities, all the general characteristics hitherto set forth. He proposes that the laboratory shall be located in Washington and be so related to the Federal Government that it may receive Congressional appropriations together with private endowments, and that its directors may have important tests and investigations made at the various civil and military bureaus already possessed of equipment suitable for special aeronautic experiments. For example, the strength of materials can be measured at the Navy Yard; the properties of hydroplane floats or models can be studied at the Model Basin; detailed engine tests can be made at the Bureau of Standards; special meteorological investigations can be conducted at the Weather Bureau.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Still other physical and mechanical researches may well be carried on at universities and technical institutes in co-operation with the scientific staff of the national laboratory. But that important class of experimentation and study, for which we have at present no funds nor equipments, should be the peculiar task of the aerodynamical laboratory itself.

This establishment Captain Chambers proposes to place in the grounds of the Smithsonian Institution, where it may use the old shops and laboratories employed in Langley's aeronautic work, and may enjoy ready at hand many other facilities, such as offices, library, heat, light and power, a museum for models, an administrative force for receiving endowment funds and keeping accounts. A further reason for choosing this locality is that it is near to a large dead-level tract on the Potomac River front which, being Federal property, may be used for an aerodrome for land flights and manœuvers, while the river itself may serve for experimentation and practice with flying-boats. Hard by this fields are the Navy Yard shops, the Model Basin, three lofty open steel towers suitable for meteorological experiments, the Fort Myer garrison, the War College, and Washington Barracks where the Signal Corps has been instructing officers in the use of hydroaeroplanes. Finally the field, since it forms an undeveloped extension of the Monument Grounds and the Speedway, just below the White House, is most conveniently accessible to all the officers, both legislative and executive, of the National Government residing in Washington, who might well wish to witness aeroplane demonstrations and keep informed of the progress of civil and military aviation. Needless to add that the proposed tract is skirted by the railway and steamboat lines leading to the national capital. All in all, Captain Chambers considers that no more ideal location for an aeronautic laboratory and aerodrome exists anywhere in the world; ideal for both Federal and industrial activities; ideal for the Army, for the Navy, and, since Washington is a Mecca for business men, ideal for the convenience of the fabricator and seller of air craft, especially craft of the type designed for the use of the Government itself.

For the general supervision of the laboratory, Captain Chambers, having in view the efficient work of the British Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, proposes that, in addi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to the director and his staff, there shall be a board, or council, empowered to outline the policies of the establishment, and broadly to initiate and review its activities, so as to provide most liberally and equitably for all the aeronautic interests of the nation. This council should not be a large body, but should comprise representative men, for the most part learned and technical; not indeed all specialists, but all interested in the sane development of aerial navigation; men of broad vision and experience whose presence shall guarantee fair treatment, as well to those who devise and manufacture aerial machines as to those who use them for any worthy end, whether of commerce, recreation, or military art. A special task of the council might well be to shield the scientific staff from the importunities and pressure of persons desiring to obtain, at the public expense, technical and laboratory aid in enterprises too purely private for the general interest, and for which nominal fees should be charged. Another function of the council, if in time it should become the recipient of suitable endowment funds, might be the offering of prizes and the granting of rewards for meritorious aeronautic achievements outside of the institution.

Summarizing the complete rôle of an ideal aerodynamic laboratory, Captain Chambers recognizes the following functions: "(1) Execution of verification tests by means of nominal fees; (2) facilities to technical men for prosecuting original researches; (3) execution of researches in accordance with a programme arranged by the council; and (4) reward for commendable results accomplished outside of the laboratory."

"Inasmuch," concludes his report, "as more definite information regarding the actual cost of a dignified and creditable, but modest and sufficient, installation should be obtained, and as the details of the plan, the scope, the organization, and the location of such an important undertaking should not be left to the recommendations of one man, *I respectfully recommend that a commission or board be appointed to consider and report to the President, for recommendation to Congress, the necessity or desirability for the establishment of a national aerodynamic laboratory, and on its scope, its organization, the most suitable location for it, and the cost of its installation.*"

The general plans for a national aerodynamic laboratory outlined by the Navy Department met with prompt recognition and distinguished favor. On December 19, 1912, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President of the United States, acting on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, made three days previously, created an Aeronautical Commission to report on the proposed laboratory, with a view to submitting a well-considered recommendation to Congress at an early date. Four statesmen and fifteen men of scientific training and experience were appointed on the Commission. Of the scientists and engineers all have been deeply interested in the progress of aeronautics; and the majority have made researches in aerodynamics or kindred branches. The membership represents widely different sections of the country and sufficiently diversified aeronautic interests.

If, after the report of this temporary body and the ensuing recommendation of the President, Congress shall create a permanent Aeronautic Commission charged with the duties of supervising the tests and researches of a national aeronautic laboratory and of allied establishments, it will be but following an excellent precedent. For nearly four years such a commission, known as the Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, has been actively at work in Great Britain. The renowned physicist, Lord Rayleigh, is its president. The other members, a dozen in all, include investigators in aerodynamics and cognate branches who have achieved world-wide distinction. And during the brief period of their labor they have amply justified the expectations of the people, and the hopes entertained by the Prime Minister of England in appointing the Committee. Nor is the work of this body at all unique. In France, in Germany, in Russia, in Italy, highly endowed aerotechnical institutes, both governmental and private, are vigorously prosecuting the greatest variety of investigations demanded by the constructional and military arts. These institutes have profoundly influenced the development of both branches of aerial locomotion. Though they cannot be described here, in closing, they may be said to have amply repaid the cost of their foundation and to warrant the establishment in America of an aeronautical laboratory which, in its directorate, its technical staff and its endowment, shall rank with the best in the world.

A. F. Zahm.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BANANAS AND DIPLOMACY

BY CHESTER LLOYD JONES.

To those in world-trade names of countries and regions suggest their products. It has always been so. The East Indies four hundred years ago meant spice; two hundred years ago China meant silks and tea; Canada meant fur. The Caribbean to Queen Elizabeth meant gold—it was the route of the treasure-ships of Spain — to Washington it meant sugar and molasses, and to our children it will mean bananas.

The Panama Canal has so occupied our attention for the last decade that we have overlooked a significant economic change taking place independently of the forces which promise so radically to change the transportation routes of world commerce. Economists tell us that the trend of diplomacy like the trend of all other things human is determined by the food-supply. If this be true, Caribbean diplomacy will be determined by the banana crop. This side of the Isthmus at the beginning of the twentieth century there are growing up food products which will exercise an influence upon international politics unconnected with the Panama Canal and of an importance which can be measured only in prophecy.

New foods often make their way slowly, especially among older nations. The English are still behind the Scotch in their appreciation of the value of oats for human food; the potato came into its own in Germany only in the second half of the nineteenth century and Europe still looks upon maize as fit nourishment only for the lower animals and the poor. But even prejudice yields to proof. The development of the banana market illustrates both conservatism and its overthrow.

America alone among the civilized portions of the globe realizes the value of this new food. Location rather than adaptiveness till recently explained the fact. When refrigeration was unknown and fast steamships for freight

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

service still a thing of the future, bananas could be marketed only within areas easily accessible from the regions in which the fruit was produced. Large quantities grew wild, enormous amounts were consumed locally, but the surplus either went to waste or was used to fatten pigs, as is still the case with the inferior product. Even in the United States until a generation ago the banana was a fruit counted a luxury rather than a valuable food.

The market for bananas in the United States was developed largely through the efforts of one man. Forty years ago Captain L. D. Baker was engaged in trade between the Orinoco River and Boston. On one trip he called at Port Morant, Jamaica, for a cargo of bamboo for paper-making and carried back a few bunches of bananas, then a curiosity in the New England markets. The venture proved profitable and the captain thereafter made several trips a year to Port Antonio, Jamaica, to take cargoes of bananas to Boston. Later he was a member of a firm formed to prosecute the trade, which in time became one of the great fruit companies.

How important the trade has become is illustrated by the figures of exports. In 1911 there were sent from Caribbean countries in the export trade 52,936,963 bunches, which on the average of 140 bananas to the bunch, represents a total of over 7,400,000,000 bananas. In 1912 the continental United States alone consumed 44,520,539 bunches, or over sixty bananas for each man, woman and child in the Union. The sources from which they came are indicated by the following table compiled from the consular returns for 1912:

BANANA SUPPLY OF THE UNITED STATES 1912

Jamaica	15,467,918
Honduras	7,151,178
Costa Rica	7,053,664
Panama	4,581,500
Cuba	2,478,581
Nicaragua	2,270,100
Guatemala	2,017,650
Colombia	1,542,988
Mexico	817,006
British Honduras	557,160
Dominican Republic	304,000
Dutch Guiana	261,548
Others	17,246
Total	44,520,539

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The world supply in 1911 as shown by the same records was:

Country of Origin	Quantity (Bunches)
Dominican Republic	404,000
Mexico (Frontera Province)	750,000
Honduras	6,500,000
Costa Rica	9,309,586
Jamaica	16,497,385
Colombia	4,901,894
Panama	4,261,500
Canary Islands	2,648,378
Cuba	2,500,000
Nicaragua	2,225,000
Guatemala	1,755,704
British Honduras	525,000
Dutch Guiana	387,516
Others	250,000
Total	52,915,963

Two facts appear from these figures: with the exception of the Canary Islands, all the countries producing large quantities of bananas for export border the Caribbean, and the United States consumes 85 per cent. of all bananas exported—five times as much as all the rest of the world. Even with us the great increase in banana consumption comes in recent years. The value of imports was $5,877,835 in 1900; $9,897,821 in 1905; $11,642,693 in 1910; $14,368,330 in 1912.

The business, especially when the fruit must be sent long distances, demands organization for collecting fruit from small planters, and large capital for steamers with refrigerating appliances. In fact, reliance on private planters has proven unsatisfactory and the big banana-marketing companies now own extensive plantations throughout the West Indies and on the mainland.

European countries are beginning to appreciate the new food; in fact, the most rapid increase of consumption and the best prices are now obtained there rather than in the United States.

Though cargo trade in bananas to the United States started as early as 1869 it was not until 1900 that full shiploads went to England. The development of the trade with Great Britain is due to the enthusiasm of Sir Alfred Jones, under whose auspices was formed a direct line running to the West Indies. The incorporators agreed in re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

turn for an annual subsidy of $200,000 to take to England from Jamaica, 20,000 bunches of bananas a week. The objects of the public support were to strengthen the commercial ties of the West Indies and the mother-country, to encourage small planters, and to lessen, or if possible overcome, the economic supremacy of the United States in the British West Indies. Another independent line also entered the field with thirteen vessels devoted to the Jamaica-Great Britain fruit trade.

The outcome has not been altogether satisfactory. The Imperialistic purpose of the subsidy failed but the banana trade was given a recognized place in the British markets which, with the exception of those of the United States, furnish the largest demand found in any country of the world. The first three years the trade went well. The company organized a subsidiary concern to buy fruit from the planters. The supply was adequate and the market growing. In 1903, however, came a cyclone which temporarily destroyed the banana fields and compelled reliance on Central American plantations. As a result the subsidiary purchasing company fell into the hands of the American corporation, and this brought about an anomalous position for the subsidized British Company. But since no breach of contract had been committed the arrangement continued until 1911 when the entire subsidy lapsed. Tenders for a new service in 1910 failed as Jamaica was not willing to continue her share of the subsidy. New offers were asked, to be opened December 31, 1912. But though the experiment of public support had not been a success in all respects, it had opened the British market to the banana trade and made the United Kingdom the best European market for the fruit.

Before 1908 the demand for bananas in France was so small that they were not separately tabulated in the customs accounts, but returned in the remainder column headed "other fruits." Now the demand is growing there also. Recent imports are as follows: 1908, 5,697.6 metric tons (2,204.6 English pounds); 1909, 9,097.1; 1910, 13,522.6; 1911, 17,813.3. In the latter year the importations were valued at almost a million dollars.

Other continental markets show a similar development. Germany took only 320 metric tons of bananas in 1899; in 1911 the amount was 30,438 tons and in the first nine months

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of 1912 in spite of bad crops, 28,274. Here, as in France, the variety at first preferred was a small kind grown in the Canary Islands. West Indian bananas are now being introduced. One corporation engaged in the trade has acquired by concession from Colombia extensive plantations which come into bearing in 1913. It is building a shipping port at its own cost at Puerto Caesar. For the present it secures its supplies from Jamaica and Honduras. It is planned to establish a service of banana steamers and distribute the fruit throughout Germany in specially built cars.

In March, 1912, a boat arrived from Jamaica with the first cargo shipment of bananas sent to the continent. It was followed by another, but the fruit arrived in bad condition. In December a third attempt with improved arrangement for refrigeration was made and proved a success. It brought 29,000 stalks from Puerto Cortez, Honduras, of which 6,000 were discharged at Havre, 10,000 at Rotterdam, and 13,000 at Hamburg. Shipments were also begun in September, 1912, from Vera Cruz to France.

Holland too is making a beginning in direct importation from the West Indies. Formerly the supply came through Hull, England, and in 1907 was only 100 tons. In 1912 it was 3,000 tons. Direct shipments from the West Indies were started in July of that year, one ship carrying 50,000 bunches, of which 21,000 entered at Rotterdam, and the larger part of the remainder went to France and Southern Germany, with smaller shipments to North Germany, Scandinavia and Russia.

These figures show that the world is just awakening to the value of the banana as food. If the present development continues the acreage devoted to banana-growing must rapidly increase. This can be easily done, for the areas suitable have as yet only been touched. Improved refrigeration and quick steam service will continue to widen the area in which the product can be marketed, and besides its present use as a fruit it will be used, as it now is in the tropics, where it is boiled green as a vegetable and manufactured into a confection known as banana figs. The development of the banana flour industry also promises to open a market for the product of areas too distant to profit by the demand for fresh fruit, just as the perfection of the manufacture of copra, the dried meat of the cocoanut has opened up a new industry reaching to the farthest islands of the Pacific.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The increased production of the banana in its natural state and the diversification of its uses promise to introduce a new and hitherto neglected factor in our food-supply. If present development continues, it will raise the Caribbean region from its dependence on foreign markets for food to one of the regions from which an important part of the world's food-supply will be drawn. The wheat-fields of the Dakotas and Manitoba will meet as one of their competitors in feeding the world, the banana plantations of the American Mediterranean.

But the development will have consequences not alone economic. Plantations represent capital which will demand protection from disorder. Their introduction will emphasize for the countries of Central America and Northern South America, the importance of protecting life and property if they expect to avoid international complications that may threaten their independence. The world is becoming impatient of the nations which insist on the divine right to misrule themselves. The introduction of capital, however, besides increasing their duties in the keeping of order, contributes to the solution of that problem. It increases the national wealth, furnishing a larger basis for the creation of national income by which orderly progress can be assured. Further with steady work and larger, stabler income the wants of the people will expand, giving them greater interest in the maintenance of the order which makes the satisfaction of those wants possible.

Greater wants in turn promote local industrial development and greater international trade. The cheap gaudy calico which forms the largest item in the imports of Central America will no longer satisfy, once the population reaches a higher level of subsistence. International trade will increase, the importance of tariff agreements will grow and the international competition for the market will become more keen. The banana trade will increase appreciably the importance of international relations in the Caribbean.

An immediate consequence of the development of the direct trade with Europe now just beginning is to threaten the supremacy of the United States in some of the Central American markets. People buy their goods, other things being equal, in the countries where their own products find their best sale. If improved transportation facilities for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the banana trade develop between the Caribbean and European ports, it is but natural that European manufactured goods will be carried on the return voyage.

Already our Central American consuls have warned us of the coming competition which we must expect in that region from the new direct outlets for French, German and English trade. On the north Honduras coast for example, all transportation facilities until recently served American ports alone, but still thirty per cent. of the imports were of European goods. The direct communication cannot but increase the keenness of the competition. We have been fortunate heretofore because especially in some of the regions of Central America and in Jamaica we have been practically the only great buyer of the most important product of the country. If present developments continue this advantage along with our favored conditions of transportation, will disappear.

Great as the blessings of the Panama Canal will be to the trade of the world and to that of the United States in particular, we must not let the new markets which it will develop beyond the Isthmus make us forget that region so rich in possibilities which lies this side of the continental divide and so much nearer our own markets. Friendship with our near neighbors is no less important than the good will of people over wide seas. One of the most important, and from our past experience let us remember, one of the most delicate problems with which our men of state have to deal, is the diplomacy of the Caribbean.

CHESTER LLOYD JONES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHERUBIM

BY FLORENCE EARLE COATES

Two angels stood at Eden's gate
  And neither uttered word:
In the eyes of one, indignant hate
  Flamed like the flame of his sword.
The other's brand burned also red
  With the fire that, avenging, sears,
And he waved the warning thing of dread;
  But his eyes were soft with tears.

They twain had watched the Fall's disgrace,
  But only one had seen
The mortal pain in the woman's face—
  Where never pain had been:
Had marked the clasp of the woman's hand
  On his who, Eden gone,
Seemed through her trembling touch new-manned,
  As he drew her gently on.

Two angels turned from Eden's gate,
  For Man had wandered far:
The one passed quickly, joy elate,
  From star to beckoning star;
But the other angel sighed, as lone
  The heavenly way he trod,
And came at last to the awful throne,
  And fell at the feet of God.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then spake God's voice:—"What earth-born grief
Dims radiance such as thine?"
The angel sighed:—"I beg relief
For woes that are not mine!—
I plead for them that exiled live;
If grace be of thy plan,
Have mercy!—ah, have mercy! Give
Some comfort, Lord, to Man!"

The fearful angel waited: came
Long silence, then the Voice:—
"Love cannot take from wrong its blame:
Man's woes are of Man's choice;
Yet do thou bear—thy pity's price—
To them that outcast grope
This last, best gift of Paradise—
This key whose name is Hope!"

FLORENCE EARLE COATES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN NIETZSCHE AND STRINDBERG

BY HERMAN SCHEFFAUER.

It became known only recently that a most interesting, though brief, correspondence had taken place between Friedrich Nietzsche and August Strindberg. These two strange and mighty spirits had saluted each other from a distance, had exchanged a few ringing messages and then passed on—Nietzsche to that death in life which shrouded his mind in darkness and Strindberg, urged along by the whirlwinds of his tempestuous temperament, to new sorrows and disasters. The death of Strindberg in 1912 has apparently broken the seals of silence imposed upon his own letters, and the entire correspondence, after lying buried for twenty-five years, has now been given to the public for the first time by Frau Forster Nietzsche, the sister of the dead philosopher.

The first volley in this intense and pyrotechnic interchange of letters is given by Nietzsche in a long letter in which he lays bare his hope and his despair—an utterance already tinged with that fierce and tragic megalomania into which his long isolation and the indifference of the world had plunged him. The last letter, a mere line of three or four words is also written by Nietzsche. It is, to quote a simile used by himself in another place, "like a rifle-shot" —above his grave, one might add.

The feverish and rhapsodical note in Nietzsche's letters is accounted for, not only by the dreadful loneliness of soul in which he found himself, but, also, by the fact that his super-normally active mind was already beginning to totter under the influence of overwork, illness, nervous strain and the effects of the drugs which he used to combat insomnia.

Some time before he entered into correspondence with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Swedish man of letters, Nietzsche had made the acquaintance of Georg Brandes, the distinguished Danish critic who had called his attention to Strindberg as a mind more or less in affinity with his own. Brandes was perhaps the first European to give publicity to the thought and philosophy of Nietzsche, at that time a still unrisen sun in the firmament of modern Europe. Brandes had written articles and given lectures upon Nietzsche at Copenhagen. The teacher of the Superman had been deeply moved by this first public recognition. His heart was full of gratitude toward Brandes, but this recognition of his message by a foreigner merely increased Nietzsche's anger against the unbroken silence and indifference he encountered everywhere in his own Germany. The great truths he had discovered and proclaimed met with no response in Germany, fulfilling the ancient judgment sent upon the prophet, and this neglect bore upon his soul with a crushing force. All the more ardently, therefore, did he seek for recognition in other lands. He had just completed that strange work *Ecce Homo,* the burning biography of his soul, in which he crowns himself with the ultimate glory of all battles and all philosophies, and sits throned in victory upon the ruins of the old morality—the anti-Christ triumphant. He is anxious that this book be given to the world in four languages at once. This is his chief motive for addressing Strindberg. In this letter one is able to recognize a certain likeness to the expressions and attitude of mind in *Ecce Homo*:

"Dear Sir:—The highly valued note of Monsieur Taine's which I inclose is my excuse for asking your advice in a matter of great importance to me. I am keenly anxious to obtain an audience in France, in fact this is for me an absolute necessity. Being, as I am, the most independent and perhaps the strongest spirit in our world to-day, one doomed to the fulfilment of a stupendous task, it is impossible that I should allow myself to be constrained from greeting the few persons willing to listen to me, by the barriers which an abominable dynastic national policy has erected between the peoples. And I gladly acknowledge that above all I seek such persons in France. I am well acquainted with all that transpires in the intellectual world of France. I am told that my manner of writing is really French, even though in my *Zarathustra,* I have attained a perfection in the German language unequaled hitherto by any other German.

"If I may be permitted to say so, my ancestors on my father's side were Polish noblemen, and my maternal grandmother lived in Weimar in the days of Goethe—all of which is sufficient reason for my being

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in an almost unimaginable degree, the loneliest of all living Germans to-day. No word of recognition has ever come to me—and, honestly, I have never demanded it—now I have readers everywhere, in Vienna, in St. Petersburg, in Stockholm, in New York, all intelligences of the highest order, who do me honor. But such are wanting to me in Germany.

"Since the time when, at the age of twenty-four, I was called to a professorship at the University of Basle, it has, fortunately, not been necessary for me to maintain a constant warfare and to waste my energies in a reaction against adverse influences. In Basle I encountered the honored and venerable Jacob Burckhardt, who from the very beginning showed a great interest in me.—I also enjoyed a most intimate friendship with Richard Wagner and his wife who at that time lived at Tribschen, near Lucerne—a friendship in every way of the utmost value to me. It is possible that after all, I am myself a musician from of old.

"It was illness that forced me to withdraw myself from these relationships and then plunged me into a condition of the profoundest introspection—such as few men have ever been subject to. And since there is in my nature nothing that is either morbid or capricious, this loneliness has been to me, not an affliction, but rather an invaluable distinction, a state of *cleanliness*. No one has ever accused me of wearing a gloomy mien—not even myself. I believe that I have become familiar with more evil and more questionable worlds of thought than any one else, but only because it lies in my nature to love what lies apart. I account the spirit of gaiety as one of the proofs of my philosophy. . . . Perhaps I may be able to prove this to you in the two books which I send you to-day.

"Yours,
"FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE."

Evidently, one of these books which Nietzsche sent to Strindberg was his *Zarathustra*. Its beauty of language and sublimity of thought must have aroused Strindberg's highest admiration, for in his reply to the foregoing letter, he writes:

"DEAR SIR:—There is no doubt that you have bestowed upon humanity the deepest book that it possesses, and moreover, have had the courage and possibly also the urging to spit these magnificent words straight into the faces of this pack of rogues! For that I thank you! Nevertheless it appears to me that in your liberality of spirit, you have to some degree flattered the criminal types. If you regard the hundreds of photographs which illustrate Lombroso's types of criminal, you will be convinced that the felon is a low sort of animal, a degenerate, a weakling who does not possess the necessary faculties to enable him to evade the more powerful laws which oppose themselves to his will and power. Just observe how stupidly moral most of these brutes really appear! What a disillusion for morality!

"And you desire to be translated into our Greenlandish tongue! Why

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not into French or English? You may judge of our intelligence by the fact that there was talk of putting me into an asylum because of my tragedy, and that this mob-majority has succeeded in imposing silence upon so fine and lofty a spirit as Brandes.

"I conclude all my letters to my friends; Read Nietzsche! That is my *Carthago est delenda!*

"At all events your greatness will decline from the very moment when you become known and understood, and the dear mob begins to acclaim you as one of its own kidney. It is better that you preserve that aristocratic aloofness, and permit us other ten thousand spirits of finer fire to make pilgrimages to your holy of holies in order to refresh ourselves to the full. Let us guard the esoteric truth in order to keep it pure and whole, and not allow it to become common property save by means of devoted disciples—in whose name I sign myself,

"AUGUST STRINDBERG."

This letter gave the greatest joy to Nietzsche—he called it the "first letter of an historical significance which had ever reached him." The influence of his own thought upon Strindberg is noticeable in Strindberg's remarkable tale of *Tschandala* which he wrote about this time. The following letter was apparently written by Nietzsche before he had received the foregoing one from Strindberg. The books which had crossed each other were *The Twilight of the Idols* and *The Father*. The latter is Strindberg's tragedy which had just been translated into French under the title *Père* with a foreword by Zola.

"DEAR SIR:—I fancy our books must have crossed each other! I read your tragedy twice with the greatest emotion. I was astonished beyond all measure to find a work in which my own conception of love—war with regard to its means and in its fundamental laws, nothing less than the deadly hatred of the sexes,—had been expressed in so splendid a manner. This play is really destined to be performed at M. Antoine's Théâtre Libre in Paris! You ought to demand this of Zola. He is at this moment priding himself on the fact that he is attracting attention.

"I am inclined very much to regret the foreword he has contributed, though I should have been sorry to miss reading it—for it contains countless naïvetés. The fact that Zola cares nothing "for abstract qualities," reminds me of a German translator of one of Dostoieffsky's novels who also cared nothing for abstract qualities—he simply left out *des raccourcis d'analyse*—they discomfited him! How odd, too, that Zola is unable to distinguish between types and *Etres de raison!* and that he should demand the *état civil complet* for your tragedy! And when he finally tried to make a question of race of the whole matter, I almost shook with laughter! As long as taste really existed in France, the whole instinct of the race showed itself opposed to all that he represented—it is precisely the Latin race which protests against

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Zola. In the final analysis he is a modern Italian—he worships the *verisimo*. . . .

"With expressions of my highest esteem, Yours,
"NIETZSCHE."

"Torino, Via Carlo, Alberto 6, III.
"Nov. 27, 1888."

Now follows Nietzsche's reply to Strindberg's letter:

"TORINO, VIA CARLO, ALBERTO 6, III.

"DEAR SIR:—I have in the mean time received a copy of *Der Vater* from Germany—a proof that I am also trying to interest my friends in the father of *The Father*. M. Antoine's theater is designed to risk new ventures. Your play in comparison with what has already been risked on that stage is absolutely innocent. It went so far that Albert Wolf in a leading article in *Le Figaro* blushed publicly in the name of France. M. Antoine is an eminent actor, who will at once adapt himself to the part of the riding-master. I advise you not to drag Zola into the affair any further, but to send a letter and a copy of the play direct to M. Antoine, Directeur du Théâtre Libre. They are fond of foreign plays.

"A great funeral is taking place outside with much gloomy pomp—it is Il Principe de Cavignani, Cousin of the King, Admiral-in-Chief of the Italian fleet. . . .

"Ah! what a light you have thrown upon your countrymen, the Swedes. And how envious I am! You underrate your good fortune: *O fortunates nimium sua si bona nesciunt*—in not being a German. No other civilization but the French is worth while, there is no sham about it, it is based on reason itself—and must necessarily be the right one. Do you wish a proof of it? You are yourself a proof!

"For many years I have been reading nothing but the *Journal des Débats*. In expectation of this opening of my little Panama Canal toward France, I have indefinitely postponed the further publication of any new writings of mine—three are quite ready for the press. The next thing will be the translation of the two leading books, *Beyond Good and Evil*, and *The Twilight of the Idols*—with these I shall then be introduced to France.

"With all good wishes.

"NIETZSCHE."

This letter is followed almost immediately by another. Nietzsche has grown impatient. It is dated from Turin, December 7, 1888. He asks whether his previous letter could have been lost—and recounts his admiration for Strindberg's *Père*—"that masterpiece of hard psychology" and once more suggests that he compel Zola to present it on the Parisian stage. He proceeds:

"There is no doubt that the hereditary criminal is decadent, even feeble-minded. But the history of criminal families, for which a vast

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount of material has been collected by Galton in his *Hereditary Genius,* always leads us back to some individual who happened to be too strong for some particular stratum of society. The last great trial of the criminal Prado gives us a classical example. Prado was superior to his judges and his lawyers in self-control, spirit and audacity. In spite of this the severe strain he had been under had produced such heavy physical consequences that certain witnesses were able to recognize him only by means of old portraits.

"And now a few words between ourselves—entirely between ourselves. When your letter reached me yesterday—the first letter in all my life which did *reach* me—it happened that I was just busy with the last manuscript revision of *Ecce Homo.* Since there are no more accidents in my life—I cannot regard you as an accident either! Why do you write letters which arrive at such moments as this?

"*Ecce Homo* ought to appear simultaneously in German, French and English. I sent the manuscript to my own publisher yesterday—as soon as a sheet is ready, it must be given into the hands of translators. But where are these translators to be found? Upon my word, I had no idea that you yourself were responsible for the excellent French into which your *Vater* has been translated! I thought it was really a masterful translation. In case you should yourself be willing to undertake the French translation of my work, I should consider myself the luckiest of mortals in being so favored by this miracle of a propitious coincidence.

"Between ourselves, in order to translate my *Ecce Homo* a poet of the first order is required. It is an expression, a *raffinement* of feeling, a thousand miles above the capabilities of the ordinary 'translator.' Nor is it by any means a long work—the French edition (possibly by Lemerre, the publisher of Paul Bourget?) would make one of their usual volumes at 3fr. 50. Since it contains absolutely unheard-of things, and if I may say so, is written in the language of a world-commander, we shall exceed even *Nana* in the number of our editions.

"Then again it is anti-German to the verge of annihilation. I am on the side of French civilization throughout the entire work (the German philosophers I call 'unconscious' counterfeiters). Nor is the book in any case a dull one. I have written it in quite a 'Prado' style. In order to protect myself against German brutality (confiscation) I intend to send the first copies, before publication, to Prince Bismarck and the young Kaiser with a written declaration of war: only the military and not the police will be permitted to answer me. I am a psychologist.

"I trust, dear Sir, that you will give this matter your kind consideration. It is something of supreme importance. For I am powerful enough to break the history of humanity into two parts."

The peculiar rancour of Nietzsche against his own country is strongly in evidence in the foregoing letter. It is due largely to the pathological condition in which he happened to be at that time. At heart he was in all essentials a true German.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Strindberg's answer is as follows:

"It gave me great pleasure to receive a few words from your master-hand with regard to my much misunderstood tragedy. I must tell you that I was forced to give the publisher the proceeds of the complete editions before he would agree to its publication. And then in recompense for this, an old lady fell dead during the performance at the theater, another woman fainted and when the straight-jacket* was produced on the stage, three-fourths of the audience rose like one man and ran from the theater bellowing like mad bulls!

"And you expect me to ask M. Zola to have my play produced for the Parisiennes of Henri Becque! I'm afraid it would have deplorable consequences in that city of *Maris Complaisants.*

"And with regard to your affair.

"I sometimes write directly in French (see the inclosed article with its *'boulevard,'* and yet somewhat picturesque style)—and at other times I translate my own works.

"It is almost impossible to find a French translator who would not try to 'improve' one's style according to the rules of the Normal School of Rhetoric, and deprive one's expression of all its fresh originality. The horrible translation of *Married Folk,* was made by a French Swiss for 1,000 francs. He was paid every penny of this—in spite of which it became necessary afterward to pay a further 500 francs in Paris for a complete revision. You will therefore be in a position to understand that I must regard the question of translating your book from a financial point of view, and inasmuch as I am only a poor devil (wife, three children, two servants, debts, and so forth) I could not afford to do it for less, especially since it is to be a piece of poet's work and not a mere hack's. If you are not deterred by this somewhat heavy expense, you may count upon me and my ability. On the other hand, I should be very glad to look up some reliable French translator for you—as reliable as you may expect to find.

"With regard to England I have really nothing to say, for there we have to deal with a puritanical land, delivered into the hands of women—which signifies the same thing as having fallen into a state of absolute decadence. English morality—you know what that means, my dear sir! Subscription libraries for the young person—Currer Bell, Miss Braddon and the rest! I advise you to keep clear of all that! In French you will penetrate even to the world of the blackamoors and you may snap your fingers at England. Pray consider this matter and my proposal and let me hear from you at your earliest convenience.

"Awaiting your answer I remain with expressions of the highest esteem,

Yours,

"AUGUST STRINDBERG."

It is interesting to read of Strindberg's judgment upon the English literature of his day. The stony barriers of Anglican puritanism have since then been broken down by several modern writers, and yet so far as *bourgeois* or

*The straight-jacket referred to is that which is produced in the last act of "The Father"—in order to confine him.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

family literature is concerned, his judgment still holds good. But he was wrong in his belief that England would offer no hospitality to Nietzsche. The writer is able to record that the complete English edition of Nietzsche has proved an uncommon success, due to the valiant siege laid to Britain by Dr. Oscar Levy, the scholarly leader of the English Nietzscheans, and the group of brilliant young men he has gathered about him.

Again the letters crossed; for it appears that Nietzsche's letter of December 7th reached Strindberg only after he had sent off the foregoing one. The epistle of his that follows, bears the date of December 27th and is written from Holte where the Swedish author was at that time living with his first wife.

"I acknowledge the receipt of your gracious letter and the magnificent *Genealogy of Morals*. I am once more encroaching upon your time with a poetic piece of work. It contains my observations on the problem of 'Pangs of Conscience'—and was written before I became acquainted with your works.

"My childish remarks, especially those about the future of the female sex and European peace—subjects which were epidemic in Switzerland where I lived at the time I wrote this 'Pangs of Conscience,' you must not take too seriously.

"I wish you a happy new year for 1889, and hope you will accept once more the assurances of my loftiest admiration.

"AUGUST STRINDBERG."

This letter reached Nietzsche when he had already begun to battle with the madness that was laying siege to his magnificent intellect. Strindberg's New Year's greeting sounds like some bitter mockery. Nietzsche's brief response is couched in that strange and cryptic language, full of tragic suggestion and the sense of farewell which dominated all his letters to his friends in these last few days before the final collapse of his mind under a stroke of paralysis.

"DEAR SIR:—You will receive an answer to your story in due course—it sounds like a rifle-shot. I have commanded a royal holiday at Rome, —I wish to order a fusillade.

"Until we meet again! For we shall meet again.

"*Une seule condition; Divorçons.* . . .

"NIETZSCHE CAESAR."

This amazing letter must have reacted strangely upon Strindberg. He remarked afterward that he fancied

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nietzsche was joking, but in his own reply there are undeniable traces of bewilderment, horror and confusion. The answer is in itself a masterpiece of conflicting emotions. It was written in Greek and Latin:

"DEAREST DOCTOR:—'I will, I will be mad!'
"Not without peturbation did I receive your letter and I thank you for it.

"'More rightly wilt thou live, Licinius, if thou wilt not always steer forth upon the high seas, nor, cowering fearfully before the storm, cling too closely to the treacherous coast.'
"In the mean time, all hail to madness!
"Adieu and keep in kind remembrance—

"YOUR STRINDBERG.
"(The best, the highest God.)"

Nietzsche's answer was a single line, the last flash of his mind—wrung forth in his final agony:

HERR STRINDBERG:—*Eheu!* No more! *Divorçons!*

THE CRUCIFIED ONE.

And thus these two tempestuous spirits who had approached and spoken to each other across the gulfs of time and space. stood rudely divorced. The night of a ten years' mental oblivion settled upon the hapless philosopher of the Superman, while Strindberg, the wild, eccentric genius of the North pursued the way to his own Calvary of domestic unhappiness and restless opposition to the restraints of life and environment. And now both have vanished into the void, and two new lights glitter among those stars that sway the destinies of humanity.

HERMAN SCHEFFAUER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WOMEN AND LOGIC

BY EDWARD E. HALE

THAT women are not logical is one of the recognized conventions of social life. It is one of those understandings, we might say, often enough referred to if rarely stated definitely, made the foundation of allusion or hint if not so often uttered outright. It certainly is not often stated in so many words. In fact, one would hardly know where to turn for a statement, not to say the first statement of it. And if you should succeed in finding half a dozen statements of the matter you would look long before you found any discussion of it. The most recent and indeed the only discussion that I know is that of Weininger in his book on *Sex and Character*. It may interest some who have long held this tenet because other people did, or as gained unconsciously from literature, or in some other ready-made fashion, to know grounds on which they may base a more reasoned belief.

Weininger's view is shortly this: One very necessary part of the logical faculty is memory. In order to form and use the general conceptions by which logical operations are carried on, one must have memory. In using the term A in some demonstration, for instance, one must have memory enough to be sure that A at the end stands for what A stood for at the beginning. Or if A stands for some generalization, one must have memory of the matter yesterday, or the day before, or some time other than the present to be able to generalize at all. Only so can we understand the fundamental proposition of Logic, A=A. If we had no memory this proposition would merely mean that the A we had in mind at one time is the same as the A we have in mind at some other time, which might or might not be the case. Further, Weininger's view is that the absolute woman has no memory. She appreciates the present keenly: whether

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it be the same as the past or not is a matter of indifference to her; she knows and cares nothing at all about it. Of course all women are not like that; actual women may have more memory or less, just as they may have more or less appreciation of the present. But the typical woman is without memory.

"And so it appears," says Weininger, "that woman is without logic."

If it do not so appear to any one, one may re-examine the premises. It may be incorrect to say that logic depends on memory, one can look into that idea; or it may be incorrect to say that women have no memory.

Thus our attention is attracted to other matters than the main matter with which we started. We do not look directly at the proposition, we get at it indirectly, by certain premises. Perhaps if we analyze them we shall be passed along from point to point until we get to something on which everybody will agree. We shall no longer consider whether women are logical or not. We shall leave such matters and consider especially women and their memory on one hand, or logic and its generalizations on the other, or something else. That is something which would be very interesting to do, but as Weininger himself has done so, there is no need of doing it now. Let us rather do the other thing, examine the general proposition directly; make a frontal attack, as one might say; consider the various women we see, know, or can learn about to see whether they are logical or not.

Of course, in such a study, one may be delayed at the very outset by all sorts of minor inquiries, such as, What do you mean by being logical? What is Logic? and the like. I shall not stop for such views, for if I do, we should never get started. Or at any rate, I shall stop for only one prior consideration, namely this, that it may well be that most women are illogical, for most men are.

Most men are not logical, in the scholastic sense at least. They have no idea even of what logic is. They have never studied logic, have never read a book on logic, never talked about logic. They would not be able to say what it was if you asked them. If you offer them a logical problem they have no idea of the logical way of solving it; they go ahead on a common-sense basis. For instance, if you say, "Such an one must be sick, for if he were well, he would be here."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The man acquainted with logic sees at once the fallacy of the illicit major, of denying the antecedent. Since he is not here, it is said, he is not well. He sees that the matter is a confused hypothetical syllogism of the form:—If A is B, A is C. But A is not B. A is not C. The average man, however, unacquainted with logic, will see nothing of the kind, he would not understand all about this A, B, C, or about majors and antecedents. He arrives at the same end by another process which he calls the common-sense process. When you say, "He must be sick, for if he were well he would be here," he says: "No, perhaps he is kept away for some other reason. In fact, he said something to me about going to the theater to-night." The average man would decide the question correctly, perhaps, but in a non-logical way, in a way which though not illogical had nothing at all to do with formal logic. So men, if not illogical, are as a rule non-logical or extra-logical, and it would be but natural that women should be so too. That is, they have no direct understanding of logic any more than men have. They have almost never studied logic; the proportion of women who have been to college is much less than with men, and it is in college chiefly that logic is studied. Nor have women read books on logic; there are not very many books on logic, and what there are are usually text-books which do not come in woman's way. Nor do women, as a rule, talk about logic with each other or with any one else, for the subject never comes into their minds. They may say that one or another is logical or illogical, but that is a different matter. Women are just like men in this respect. If you put to them a logical problem they will solve it by common-sense methods. They may be correct or they may not, but they will never use logical methods.

There is no use then, with women or men either, in discussing the question whether they are logical in the sense of the schools. Every one knows at once that in that sense women are non-logical and men, too. Whether "non-logical" and "illogical" are the same thing does not need to be discussed; we know just what it is that is meant.

We must look, then, for some other logic than the logic of the schools and the school-books if we want a question to discuss for a logic of the street, of the cross-road, of every-day life. And we shall have no difficulty in finding something that will be useful We often hear that such a person

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is logical or not, or that such a thing is. We have only to examine such statements to see what sort of logic it is that is in mind.

Of course the word "logical," as used in common speech, often means that we are thinking of something argumentative. We speak of a logical reason, demonstration, inference, or something of the sort. That does not mean the logic of the schools, but any kind of correct reasoning, whether based on common-sense or on anything else. Such uses, however, would probably hold a minor place in our thinking and speaking of things as logical. We should find, could we count up cases, that we more often use the words *logic* or *logical* in a different way. We more often speak of a logical order or development or sequence or outcome or something of that sort. We might speak of a logical result or a logical line of conduct, or we might speak of the logic of history or the logic of fact, where evidently there is no immediate connection with argument.

We shall find, indeed, that this idea of logic, this non-argumentative logic as we may say, has penetrated into various phases of thought where there is no question of argument, or indeed where we should say there is no question of logic. Thus in the field of art we should find that people have more and more got into the habit of speaking of logic as an element of art, not, of course, in any argumentative sense, but in the sense of natural and necessary and such as is demanded by the conditions of the case. This use is quite common among writers on music and to some degree among writers on painting, but it is most usual among writers on the drama. Almost all writers on the drama speak of a logical development, generally of plot, but sometimes of character. Mr. Archer in his latest book, that on *Playmaking*, gives a whole chapter to logic. We shall not think that this logic is the logic of schools or anything of the sort. We might imagine at first that the matter had something argumentative about it as with plays that support a thesis. But there is generally nothing argumentative about the matter any more than there is in the parallel use of the word *convincing*. People say nowadays that all sorts of things are convincing, meaning thereby that they make a definite and permanent impression. "Such and such a character is convincing," one would say, though without any sense of argument, though usually when we think

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of convincing anybody we think of arguing with him. But Mr. Archer has no idea of argument in his chapter on Logic in play-making. He sometimes speaks of proving things, but generally he has in mind the notions of coherence and consistency, the having things seem natural and the way they ought to be, the full development of all the different lines of any subject. It is not necessary to tell what Mr. Archer has to say about the logic of play-making; in fact it would be rather confusing to try to state it. Our only interest is that Mr. Archer and a great many other people have an idea about a logic which is not the logic of the schools nor the logic of argument. Logic with them is something other than a scholastic treatise or a definite demonstration. Just what it is we need not inquire now.

So when it is said that men are logical we need not suppose that it means that they are particularly argumentative. It may mean that they have a sense of consistency and coherence, that they have a feeling of what is necessary, of how a matter ought to turn out, of what is proper. On the other hand, it often does mean that they are good or sound in argument. Thus Abraham Lincoln in the estimation of those who write about him was one of the most logical of men. Those who think and say this of him almost always have in mind his powers and processes in argument. They say that he had remarkable power in getting right at the kernel or the key to any question; that he found out the especial point of importance and made that absolutely sure, that he put aside the things of no importance so that people disregarded them, and other such things. If a person wanted to argue logically and convincingly, they would advise him to study the work of Lincoln, and see how he worked out the problems which came before him. A study of Lincoln would make a man strong in argument, a logical man from that standpoint. So also people very often speak of St. Paul in the same way. They say that he is logical, meaning that he is great in argument. There is a curious passage by Dr. Van Dyke in which he says that St. Paul was great in logic, but that his mysticism was a great safeguard to his logic, and his intense practicality was a safeguard to his mysticism, and his broad, warm sympathetic humanity was the safeguard to his practicality. Here we have the interesting idea that logic is something dangerous, something that will lead one astray (we may suppose) if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one follow it out too definitely. But aside from that, the idea is that logic is a matter of argument, of proving something, of making a statement convincing by showing its connection with something else. With St. Paul as with Lincoln, as most men speak of him, logic is a matter of demonstration and proof.

Indeed, such a view is not uncommon. When we say that women are illogical we often mean that when they try to prove anything they come out at an illogical result or that they get at their result by illogical methods, that they do not argue by making inferences or deductions, but determine their result by intuition or by some other method known to themselves, or if not consciously known, at least customary. Thus a woman sees some one, for instance, and instantly forms the idea that he is hypocritical. Just how she forms this idea she does not know; it appears suddenly in her mind in definite form; it is an intuition. If you ask the reason for it, however, she will give you one. She will say it is because his eyes are too close together, or because the binding on his hat is shiny, or because one of the buttons was off his coat, or some other thing that you have not noticed at all, and that if you did notice it you would never think of connecting with hypocrisy. Nor does she really think of any connection, but just as the idea of his being hypocritical popped into her mind as soon as she saw the man, so the idea of his eyes being too close together, or of the buttons being off, or of the binding being shiny, pops into her head when you ask for the reason for such an idea. And as soon as the idea comes into her head she utters it so as to be rid of it, perhaps. In this way women make up their minds, and therefore often seem to form opinions in a very illogical way. But these things are not really illogical. It is merely that they have nothing at all to do with logic. They have nothing to do with logic considered as argument, that is.

When we consider logic a little differently, such things may be logical enough. If we mean by logic a sort of consistency or coherency, a full development or a natural outcome or something of the sort, then we shall often find that these intuitions of women are often logical enough. Thus as to man's being hypocritical because his eyes are too close together. There is really no connection, and yet as soon as the idea is suggested there is something in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expression of that narrow, intense face that irresistibly suggests all sorts of things that are hypocritical.

So when we are considering the logical element in woman's character we must remember that there are different kinds of logic. There is the logic of the schools, the logic of argument, the logic of consistency,—people even will speak of the logic of passion. We might be able to show without much difficulty that all the different kinds of logic were closely related to each other, but we need not do that now. The main thing now is to consider women and see whether they have any logic, and, if so, what kind of logic it is.

The easiest way to do this is not to go to some woman and ask her questions, but to look about and see if you do not see or hear something that bears upon the subject. The other day I was told the following:

One lady met another and they spoke about religion. One of them said that she was inclined to Christian Science. The other said that she did not like Christian Science because Christian Scientists were illogical, and she disliked illogical people. She mentioned a friend who was a Christian Scientist who had fallen down a coal-hole, and who, on having sued for damages, had received $400. She meant, I suppose, that it was inconsistent in one who did not believe in bodily hurt to exact money from people who had hurt her body. The first lady appeared also to be inclined to Unitarianism; at least she sent her children to the Unitarian Church, although she did not go herself. Her husband was a man of scientific training, and she liked to look at things in a scientific and logical way.

Now it is a cheap and conventional wit that will laugh at these ladies who admired logic when they had neither of them studied the logic of the schools nor had any idea as to what it was. They did not, of course, have any idea of scholastic logic in mind; certainly they did not have in mind any science or mode of thought that neither of them knew anything about. They used the term evidently with quite definite notions of its meaning.

It did not represent to them what it would have represented in the mouth of a professor in a lecture-room, nor in the mouth of a lawyer in a law-court. But it was used as accurately and correctly as most abstract terms are used, and if one is careful it offers a perfectly good means of getting at what each thought.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One meant by *logic* consistency between theory and practice; the other meant an exact and systematic way of thinking. Each liked logic in her own sense, though each, it may be remarked, was illogical in the sense of the other. It surely shows inconsistency between theory and practice to approve of Unitarianism and not go to a Unitarian Church, and it shows a lack of exact and systematic thinking to dislike Christian Science because one Christian Scientist has been inconsistent. But however illogical in the opinion of others, each of these ladies had the highest opinion of logic in her own sense. And so I incline to believe have most women.

One could go on and without much difficulty collect many examples of people, particularly women, saying that such and such things were logical and then doing something else, and thus showing either that they had no care for logical action or, which is more likely, that they were really governed by a logic very different from what they commonly thought of as logic. This last is the most likely. People in their actions are governed by all sorts of motives and very often by motives or causes which they themselves know nothing about. So they very often seem to act for reasons very different from the true ones, or they often act apparently for no reason at all.

An example of this latter sort may be found in the conduct of Annunciata Fearns at the trial of her father. She was in the witness-box and at a certain time and a certain question of the judge she hesitated, could not answer, and finally "in the unreflecting madness of her torment she sprang down the steps from the witness-box." When she had time to think she wished to go back there again. In this case the girl did something quite irrational, there was no reason for it, it was done in unreflecting madness. That is, so it seemed. Really, however, there was a perfectly plain reason, though one of which she was not at all conscious. Annunciata Fearns was not a real person, but a person in one of the novels of Mr. Arnold Bennett. In that novel, *Whom God Hath Joined,* Mr. Bennett presents all his characters as acting at one time or another under the influence of what he calls "an irresistible and tremendous force," so that they absolutely must do what they do and cannot possibly do anything else.

But there is another and better example to be found among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Arnold Bennett's women and that is an incident concerning Maggie and Edwin Clayhanger. Mr. Bennett has been telling how Edwin, after he had got well grown up and practically independent, used to indulge in extravagances, as his old father would have thought, and how he was always interested to see whether his father would notice them. His father usually did not notice the matters of importance, but did notice some absolute trifle. Then "Maggie would say, 'I told you what would be happening'" which would annoy Edwin. "His annoyance was caused less by Maggie's I told you so, than by her lack of logic." This lack of logic consisted in thinking it natural that her father should notice some inconceivable trifle and go into a passion. Edwin would not have minded if she had spoken of her father's noticing something large and important, but he never did. But here it was not Maggie but her father who was illogical, or rather inconsistent. He noticed the little expenses, but he did not notice the big ones; there seemed no consistency in his way of doing. Maggie was not particularly illogical in saying, "I told you so," when he spoke. She may have been as illogical as he, but even that is not obvious.

These last people Annunciata and Maggie are chosen from literature, not from life. It is rather easier to study examples in literature than in life, but of course the results when found are not quite so convincing. When we have an example chosen from real life, we can only say, "Yes, people really are like that," or else, "Some people are certainly like that," and then if we mean to decline the inference offered, we must say that those people are exceptional or something of the sort. But with cases chosen from literature, we shall easily say, "Oh, that is only in a novel, that is only what Mr. Bennett thinks, or what he wants in that story. Real people do not behave so." Naturally, examples from fiction do not have the stamp of truth that those have who are chosen from life. But the fact that they appear in fiction shows at least that the author thought that they seemed natural, and the fact that we read about them without noticing that they are unnatural shows that we think so too. So I think we may choose examples of logical or illogical women from fiction as well as from life. Mr. Bennett is supposed to have a very great knowledge of the way women behave and feel and think. So

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have other writers, Mr. Hardy and Mr. James, for instance. The former is rather famous for having his women illogical: that is, he is apt to present them as acting in ways that seem entirely opposed to reason and logic, in a manner that seems entirely the result of momentary whim and fancy. Really we should probably find as in the case of Annunciata that the action of his women is as reasonable, as much the result of definite and known causes, namely as logical, as is the action of any other women, or men either.

An interesting example is the case of Orloff and his wife as they appear in one of the stories of Maxim Gorki. Orloff was an argumentative sort of person, very regular and particular about doing everything in a perfectly reasonable sort of way. That was his way of thinking and he felt that it was natural that it should be so, seeing that he was a man. Women, he felt, were different; they did not understand logical argument; they argued enough but never logically. He often thought about his wife who was not only wholly illogical herself, but wholly unable to appreciate the logic of any one else. She was a person of blind primitive feeling. (Both it should be said were Russian peasants.)

"It would be so easy for him, he thought, to cut away the abnormal excrescence from her brain by the cold logic of his mind. What a pity that . . . it was impossible to see her frequently (they had become separated), so that day by day he might shake loose everything which barred off her mind from the action of logic."

They made quite a typical pair, Orloff and his wife (of the conventional type), he "perfectly logical and quite regularly founded on a long series of premises from the distant past," she a primitive creature of immediate emotions, who was more likely to be swayed by the enthusiasm of metaphysics than by the slow approach of logic.

There is a third way in which we can approach this question, a sort of combination of the methods of life and of literature. We can look into literature to see what women say about logic. I do not mean what books they have written on the subject, indeed I suppose they do not write any at all; nor what they say when they are consciously dealing with the subject, if they ever do, for they would very probably be mistaken or misled in such writings, as people are very apt to be who try to gather together their vague feelings and diffuse ideas on some special subject. We shall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

do better to watch for what they say by the way, to pick up hints of what they think of logic while they are talking of something else, to see how the idea comes to expression in all that they say, and what it seems to be. That is a way we often go about to find what we think of a matter. We do not always go to them and say, What do you think of such and such a *thing*? We notice and we see what they chance to say about it, or we argue back from what they say or do, as to what they must really think. Thus a young man who wishes to know what a very dear young woman thinks of him, or how she feels, does not at first go right up to her and ask. He notices what she says and does, he judges from hints, he makes his inferences from her acts. This is what the lawyers call unconscious testimony; they rate it highly, and rightly so, for it is a perfectly sound basis for judgment. One may make false inference from it, of course, or from any other fact, but if not one comes very near the truth.

Let us therefore look in this way for logic in the writings of women who appear to be typical. Let us see if in speaking of other things they do not give us some idea of what they think about logic. And first I will take as example one who all will allow is a thoroughly typical American woman, Miss Jane Addams.

There are in Miss Addams' books a number of uses of the word *logic* and its derivatives, not very many but enough to form some idea of her conception of the subject. Once it is used in the conventional sense, "quibbles of logic." Twice she uses it in reference to close development of theory, and here, significantly, she brings it into contact with the experience of life. "Was Tolstoi more logical than life warrants?" she asks. So she and her friends "repeated to each other that in all practical judgments and decisions of life we must part company with logic." A strange but common idea that logic, which purports to be the science of the nature of sound thought, should somehow be unconnected with, even opposed to life.

Such uses are probably quite conventional. But usually in her work *logical* means much the same as *consistent*, in accordance with good and sound thought. Thus she remarks that "there was a certain logic in giving the franchise only to grown men;" *i. e.*, it was, at the time, a sound and reasonable thing to do. Sometimes this consistency is only with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whatever plan, good or bad, happens to be under discussion, but often it is a consistency with some unstated and unformulated scheme or system of careful scientists. Thus "Germany is gradually evolving with a Government logically fitted to cope with the industrial situation of the twentieth century," because in Germany presumably there are people who think out problems on an idealistic basis, on a large scale,—arguing doubtless as they do so, but not all argument. We might make a number of other quotations from Miss Addams' works, but these will give the correct idea. This is the substance of what she says here and there about logic, the substance of what she thinks about it, in short, her ideas of logic.

In other words, omitting the few cases where the word means school logic or has some connection with argument, the conception of logic which appears from these uses of the word, and which therefore seems (unconsciously perhaps) to have its place in Miss Addams' mind, to regulate her ideas and language, is that of some natural and consistent system of sound thought not necessarily in the form of argument nor regulated by definite and known rules, but such as common-sense people and scientific thinkers alike would not only admit but recognize as necessarily right. She seems to recognize some system of consistent and natural thought according to which the world goes round and people carry on their affairs, as it has gone round and as they have carried them on for centuries. Not a cold, an "inexorable" logic as they sometimes say, not a fine-spun or abstruse logic, but a logic which opens to us as nearly as may be with us mortals the order of the universe, the common-sense nature of the way things go.

This is, doubtless, not what people have in mind when they say women are illogical. But if there are many women (and why not?) who, like Miss Addams, have even a slight conception of such a scheme, may we not think that their logic may be as good at least as that of the average man?

Edward E. Hale.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLAND'S NEW DRAMATISTS

BY P. P. HOWE

In these days, when art at least is international, and when freer trade than that which already obtains between the theaters of New York and London could hardly be promised by any one of the political parties, in these days there is only one boundary to our hopes of the English drama and that is the boundary that is set up where the English language ceases to be spoken. We all read one another's novels and plays to-day: a novel which has found its origin in the life of the United States, but which has in it the something universal that makes art good, takes no more time than does a Marconi message to cross the Atlantic; while a play that proves to be good in Manchester is hardly seen in London before New York and Chicago have it also. This is as it should be. The best plays, of course, like everything that is best in art, will continue to come out of some strong feeling for the local life that is definitely and particularly known. Consciousness of nationality is still, and is likely always to be, the most powerful of motives to good art. But the day has gone by when the things in an art that are local can prove a barrier through which the things that are universal can find no immediate passage. The best dramatist who has written in English in our time wrote of the life of the roads and islands of the West of Ireland, for presentation in a particular theater in Dublin; and though not ten years have passed since the first of his plays was written nor five years since his last, it would be hard to set foot in a town or city in England or America where the theater is cared for and not find his fame and influence there before you.

Between London and New York there is this especial community, that the difficulties besetting a good drama in the two places are the same. A recent English observer in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America went so far as to couple the theater he found there with the sports rather than with the art; and when he felt that this was a hard saying he hastened to add that he would have had to do just the same had it been England he was observing.* He was not without his justification. Mr. W. B. Yeats commented long ago upon the difficult paradox presented by the drama, that it has need of cities that it may find men in sufficient numbers, and that great cities tend to destroy the emotions to which good drama appeals. Be this as it may, if we direct our attention to the merely economic situation confronting the drama, we may see quite clearly that London and New York are in the same boat, upon the same sea of troubles. There is the same difficulty of the intensive cultivation of ground rents, making it necessary that a theater, because of the mere cost of existence, should pay its way at once and all the time; in competition not so much with other arts—for pictures can be shown and books printed at comparatively a fraction of the cost—but with the most strenuous of businesses. There is the same difficulty also of the confusion and deterioration of public taste in regard to the drama. In a simpler age, men did not doubt that the theater was for recreation, for a stimulated zest in life, in a word, for pleasure; but with the vehement incessance of life in a modern city, they have come to distrust their own powers of enjoyment, and to accept what is given them by worthy or unworthy tradesmen for no better reason than that it will pass without ennui the hours between dinner and supper or between supper and bed. They have lost, in the turmoil, their standard of values, and the indiscriminate newspapers have supplied them, very cheaply, with another and quite false standard. And now there is the institution of the Cinema, to give them, very cheaply again—because the mechanical is always cheaper than the human—the simulacrum of drama without its soul. The task, then, of putting back drama into the theaters and of putting it back into its position in the hearts of men is primarily a task of simplification. Whether of economics or of art, it is a matter of right principles. As long ago as the first visit of the *Comédie Française* to London, Matthew Arnold, that acute observer, saw that first and foremost the improvement of the English theater was a matter of organization. "Organize the theater," he said.

*Mr. Arnold Bennett, in *Your United States.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the last ten years the work of organizing the English theater may be said to have been begun. But you may organize the theater and still have no drama to put into it.

An observer who came to America to-day with a more spacious leisure for its theater than Mr. Arnold Bennett had, could not be satisfied, I think, at rounding in the drama of America along with its sports. An observer who came to England could not be satisfied, I am quite sure (if he were a good observer), without finding for the drama some more adequate category. But, for better or worse, American observers do not come to England in the same rich profusion as we English observers come to America. If an observer came, however, he would find himself confronted by something that he would not, I think, have found had he come twenty, or even ten, years ago. He would find himself confronted by the definite admission that the drama is an art. He would not find this admission in the universities, as the English observer finds it in those universities of America that have followed the admirable lead of Professor George Baker, of Harvard. The English universities have still place in their curriculum only for Æschylus, for Sophocles, and for Euripides amongst dramatists, because these wrote in Greek; even Shakespeare may come in only by a side door as it were, as when Professor A. C. Bradley, of Oxford, devoted lectures that should have gone to Poetry to the best consideration that has yet been given to the technique of Shakespeare as a tragic dramatist. If our observer would not find the admission in the lecture-room, however, he would find it in the seclusion of the newly formed Drama Societies, which perhaps Mr. Granville Barker would be addressing, or in the privacy of the undergraduates' chambers, where the complete works of Mr. Bernard Shaw are certainly being read. And, more important than in any university, he would find the admission in the theater. He would have to search for it; but now, in the year 1913, the admission that the drama is an art is beginning to be conceded even there.

It was not conceded twenty years ago. When Wilde wished to secure admission to the London theaters, he had to forget he was an artist. The worst things in Wilde's plays, the good women and the long-suffering politicians and the "strong curtains," are in the plays he wrote for the London theaters. The best things are in "Salome," which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was not written for any theater and which, in England, is not yet allowed to be seen in any. "The Importance of Being Earnest" was a happy accident, one of those encouraging reminders that come nowadays only once in a generation, that good art is also good business, a fact which the Elizabethans understood perfectly well. But who would think, to read Wilde's serious plays—to read, for a particular example, the dreadfully stagey and absurd soliloquy which opens the third act of "Lady Windermere's Fan"—that Ibsen and Hauptmann and Strindberg were already well known to Europe? The credit is Sir Arthur Pinero's that he first of the working English dramatists awoke to Ibsen; and even the two volumes of Mr. Bernard Shaw's tempestuous criticism cannot take it from him. Since Mr. Shaw turned from the easy business of writing about plays to the vastly more difficult business of writing them, he has never constructed a play so well as "Iris" or "Mid-Channel" is constructed. But it was not without justice, if it was without elegance, that a writer once named Mr. Shaw as "the symbol of the whole shindy." "The whole shindy" had for its purpose the admission of the drama among the arts; and Mr. Shaw, who had for years abused and bludgeoned the theater managers for their stupidity in regarding art as, on the whole, "a quaint and costly ring in the nose of Nature," must have the principal share in the partial victory we are now celebrating. He has it whether we graciously give it to him or no. Mr. Shaw has secured for himself his very fair share of the spoils that the theater has rendered up to the artist in our generation: indeed, his own personal victory has not been partial at all, it has been complete. I suppose he and Mr. Barrie are the only undoubted artists who up to the present have made any considerable amount of money out of the theater in England or America. St. John Hankin wanted none and made very little; J. M. Synge during his lifetime gave his plays free of all royalty to the Abbey Theater in Dublin; Mr. Masefield has turned aside from the theater because he has found people more willing to pay for his dramatic poems; while Mr. Granville Barker has given us an exact return of what his most ambitious play brought him in—I think it was one shilling and fourpence halfpenny.

I say that St. John Hankin did not want money, but I remember that he did. He wanted money to start a reper-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tory theater. Now if the institution of the repertory theater is not more truly even than Mr. Shaw the "symbol of the whole shindy," it is only because Mr. Shaw came first. Mr. Shaw would, in the end, have cut and thrust his way into any theater, however stupid, by sheer virtue of the pleasure-giving qualities of his wit; and profit would have accrued in the ordinary course of nature. But the first man who suggested a repertory theater suggested as credible a theater that should be run in the interest of art rather than in the interest of commercial profit. A repertory theater is a theater that presents plays *well* rather than to the maximum commercial advantage; it is a theater that goes upon the belief that it is its business to supply "the nourishment, not very easy to define, on which our imaginations live." That is to say, it remembers that the drama is an art all the time, fulfilling the function of an art. It need not, by that fact, be any the less delightful or amusing: that is important to understand. The repertory theater should be, regarded as a single theater, a great deal more delightful and amusing than any other single theater: just as it is more pleasant to be brought up on a nicely varied diet than on one consisting exclusively of porridge or peas. But if you are in the theater business, the most profitable thing you can do, from the point of view of your income for the current year, is to find an attractive play, put it on the stage, and keep it there just as long as it continues to be profitable. You would only take any other course in the belief that this ordinary commercial course was not altogether good for plays and was not altogether good for their artistic appreciation. If you were making money, an alternative course would only suggest itself if you cared very much that under this system you were not getting the best plays and you were not getting the best audiences. The man who first suggested a repertory theater did care very much. He cared more for good plays than for big profits; only, if he was a sensible man, he must have known also that in the long run, if not in the short, the best plays must make the biggest profits. The most successful piece of shoddy from Broadway or Shaftesbury Avenue can never hope to catch up with "Hamlet" as a money-maker. It is true that no repertory theater has up to the present been run at a big profit, even by Mr. Charles Frohman. But that is because no repertory theater in England is at any-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing but the beginning of its run. The repertory theater when it is really and firmly established has no other aim but to put on all the plays that are worthy and to keep them on for a very long time; indeed, to keep them on forever.

The repertory theater, then, already in being at Dublin, at Manchester, at Glasgow, at Liverpool, at Birmingham, and about to come into being at Leeds, at Bradford, and at Sheffield, is a convenient symbol of the new spirit in the English theater: it is no more. There is no particular virtue in a system other than that which issues in its works. However admirable the fig-tree in design, if it remains barren of fruits thêre is no virtue in it. If in New York to-morrow there were to be two repertory theaters, one of which gave poor plays well (as Mr. Belasco's theaters do) and one of which gave good plays ill (as certain of the repertory theaters in England have been known to do), neither of these two theaters would be so important to dramatic art as is Mr. Winthrop Ames's theater, which gives good plays well, although it does not go at all strictly upon the repertory system. The new spirit can only be held to be present when it takes expression in good plays. It is good plays that the English theater wants: given good plays, the good playgoer will mind very little by what means he gets them. Thus, of the best plays that have been written in England during the period I have under review, Hankin's and Synge's and Mr. Masefield's and Miss Baker's "Chains" and Mr. Houghton's "Hindle Wakes" were brought out by the special or repertory theaters; Mr. Barker's and Mr. Galsworthy's plays, finding their origin in the special theaters, have to some extent conquered the ordinary theaters, although not so decisively as Mr. Shaw's; whilst for Mr. Davies's comedies and Mr. Besier's "Don" and Miss Sowerby's "Rutherford and Son" we have to thank the general theater of commerce.

Occupying a position midway between the theater as Wilde left it, and the theater as our younger writers find it, stands the work of St. John Hankin. Hankin died in 1909, at the age of thirty-nine, and his collected plays have just been published. He wrote five full-length comedies and two shorter plays, all of which have been seen on the stage. At the same time he is the most readable dramatist since Wilde, not excepting Mr. Shaw. All the best dramatists are readable, although, of course, a play does not come to its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full stature until it is seen upon the stage. If we wanted another symbol of the new spirit in the theater, we might find it in this fact, that to-day plays are *read,* as they have not been read in England since the end of the Restoration. It is not very easy or delightful to read the plays of Sir Arthur Pinero. If we see why this is, we shall understand one at least of the respects in which St. John Hankin was a pioneer. Pinero's people never, or hardly ever, speak quite as people would be likely to speak in real life. When Mrs. Ebbsmith wishes to tell her lover, with whom she is living on terms of the easiest intimacy, that she likes his essay, she says, "It bristles with truth, it is vital." Now that is the sort of remark that is not *true,* although its untruth may possibly not be apparent in the theater so long as we are under the spell of the actress. "The Liars" in the theater is an amusing comedy, but it is not the sort of comedy one reads for sheer pleasure in one's library. Sir Arthur Pinero and Mr. Henry Arthur Jones wrote, and still write, speeches for actors; it was the desire of St. John Hankin to create character and to let it find its appropriate utterance in speech. He was equally clear about his difference from Mr. Bernard Shaw on the other hand. "It is the dramatist's business," he wrote once, "to represent life, not to argue about it."

If the theater of Pinero and Jones did not "represent life," and if Mr. Bernard Shaw was too prone to "argue about it," the path that St. John Hankin opened up has been followed by other writers very clearly. Mr. Granville Barker, in "The Madras House" especially, has pushed further along it than Hankin even saw; while Mr. Galsworthy has kept very austerely to the path of life as he sees it lived in the big world outside the theater. The work of these two men is so well known, however, that we may turn at once to the younger workers. Since Miss Elizabeth Baker has failed up to the present to follow up her admirable and sympathetic play of clerk life, "Chains," Miss Githa Sowerby and Mr. Stanley Houghton must be regarded as the two most promising of recent recruits to the theater. Miss Sowerby also has only one play to her name that need be seriously considered, but there is plenty of time for her to follow it with others. "Rutherford and Son" is the study of a middle-class household and of its dominance by the father, given with something of Ibsen's spareness and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economy. Mr. Houghton is a typical product of the English repertory theaters. His apprentice work for Miss Horniman's theater at Manchester—which included the amusing comedy for parents, "The Younger Generation"—prepared one for his admirable achievement in "Hindle Wakes." Here is a play that is at once exciting, as a good play should be, and almost perfectly faithful in its adherence to real life. One may think that the mill girl who refuses her employer's son in marriage is not, in her concluding outbreak, quite innocent of the suspicion of having studied Mr. Bernard Shaw; but for three-fourths of his play Mr. Houghton is master both of his story and of the best way to tell it in the theater, there can be no two opinions about that. I would group with Mr. Houghton, Mr. Charles McEvoy, Mr. Harold Brighouse, and Mr. G. J. Hamlen, each of whom has come to the London theater after a period of service with the repertory theaters in the country. Mr. McEvoy has written no one play by which his reputation may fairly stand, but he is a worker of considerable promise in the new realistic drama. Mr. Brighouse's "The Odd Man Out," while lighter in texture than Mr. Houghton's play and with a satirical turn, showed something of the same notable mastery of the stage. Mr. Hamlen's play, "The Waldies," is again a faithful study of a domestic milieu that has much in it that is admirable. The part that the Incorporated Stage Society played, by means of its periodic special performances, in introducing some of these plays to London and to the managers, should not be overlooked.

There is one writer of our time who, treading no path but his own, yet points more clearly than any other to a future for the English drama. John Millington Synge died in 1909, at the age of thirty-seven. In the six years immediately preceding his death he had written six plays. To-day everybody knows them. The great value of Synge's short work for the theater lies in the fact that he himself knew so clearly what he wanted from the theater. "On the stage one must have reality," he said, "and one must have joy." We have seen the path by which reality has come again into the English theater; but the writers who have trodden it after Hankin have not all been equally capable of joy. Mr. Galsworthy's latest play, "The Eldest Son," is truthful enough in its presentation of character and dialogue; but who would say that in its story, which is not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meet for comedy and which somehow falls short of the truly tragic, there is joy? Synge would have us impatient of all false joys, of a so-called "serious" drama on the one hand and of musical comedy on the other. The one he likened to a drug-store, and the other to a dram-shop: we should not go to the theater, he held, in the mood that we go to either. His own plays do undeniably give us that "nourishment, not very easy to define, on which our imaginations live." They do so because he knew and loved the theater without losing his knowledge and his love of life; and he alone of his contemporaries was able to join hands with Sheridan and Goldsmith, and to walk quietly and firmly on the good path without a thought of the generations in which the English theater had gone astray in the wilderness and buried its head in the sand.

Synge is not altogether without a successor. Mr. Masefield has written three plays with something of the same spirit of vigorous reality in them, and it cannot be doubted that he will write more. His "Tragedy of Nan," with Synge's "Playboy," "Shadow of the Glen," and "Riders to the Sea," must certainly rank as the major things of the modern English drama. Nor would it be easy to overestimate their influence. Mr. T. C. Murray, a schoolmaster in County Cork, has contributed two plays, "Birthright" and "Maurice Harte," to the repertory of the Irish Players that are the best plays they have had since the death of Synge. A moment of good drama not unworthy of Mr. Masefield is contained in a one-act play by Miss Gwen John, called "Edge o' Dark," which has unfortunately come under the ban of the English Examiner of Plays. But if there are artists able to work in the medium of the theater they will not be deterred by the fact that the theater is not yet completely in order for them.

That it is not, is true. But it is vastly more ready for them than it was a couple of decades ago. If the organization of the theater were all that might be wished, it could not be the case, for example, as it is the case, that the plays of St. John Hankin, so well adapted to give pleasure through the general theater, have never yet found their place there. That is the situation in England. I do not think the situation is really very different in America.

P. P. Howe.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ENGLISH LITERATURE'S DEBT TO THE BIBLE

BY WILLIAM GILMER PERRY

THE history of English literature begins and ends with the name of God. The opening verses of Caedmon, the first of English bards, chant the praises of the Almighty Maker of all things; the last words of Tennyson and Browning, who close the long line of imperial torch-bearers, sound the pæan of faith triumphant; and, like a golden thread through the entire web of our literature, runs the influence of the English Bible.

This influence may be definitely recognized as threefold—first, upon the thought and spirit of our literature; second, upon its language; third, upon its content.

To trace the first influence is difficult; it is as if one should attempt to distinguish the dye from the fabric that it colors. Literature is an expression of life; and the very essence of Anglo-Saxon civilization is the spirit and thought that finds its supreme expression in the Bible.

To distinguish its influence upon the language is scarcely less difficult, except where—as in the work of De Quincey and Ruskin—there is a strongly marked echo, in word and cadence, of Biblical phraseology. In much the same manner as its spirit has entered into our life, has its speech entered into our language. The age of Chaucer produced Wyclif's translation, and that of Shakespeare the Authorized Version; the English Bible presided over the birth of our language, and did much to determine our speech to-day. Nor has its influence been less conserving than formative. During the eighteenth century, when under the artificiality of Pope and the classicism of Johnson, the very genius of our tongue seemed threatened with disaster, the Bible remained the one unchanging standard of English diction. This Book held our speech true to its orbit; not merely was checked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this movement away from its standards, but with ever-accelerating speed we are returning toward them.

The third influence of the Bible, that upon the content of our literature, is more readily traced. From the first, the noble directness and idyllic charm of the Scriptural narratives made a powerful appeal to the literary artist, and there has grown up a large and increasingly important body of literature that has sought its subject matter in the pages of the Old and New Testaments. This choice of subject sometimes appears directly, as in "Samson Agonistes" or "Saul." More often, however, it appears indirectly, in the form of allusion, as in "Rizpah" or "The Cottar's Saturday Night."

It is to be expected that during the period preceding the Norman Conquest the greater part of the literary output in England should have drawn largely upon the Bible narrative; for not only was there a great dearth of literary material, but most of the writing came from the shadows of the cloister. It is interesting, however, to see how much earlier the stories of the Bible were taken into our literature than its spirit. The delight of these old authors in the overthrow of Pharaoh and the bloody tale of Judith shows how close they still were to their Viking ancestors; and such a story as "The Harrowing of Hell" indicates how entirely they failed to understand the nature and mission of Jesus. Still, even when the Normans came and brought with them their vast wealth of tales of knightly quest, the Bible remained an exhaustless storehouse of literary subject. The *Cursor Mundi,* which in flowing verse tells the story of God's dealing with men from the creation till the final redemption, consciously and avowedly competes for the favor of its readers with the chivalric adventures of "The Song of Roland" and of "Sir Gawain and the Green Knight"; and the most perfect piece of writing of this pre-Chaucerian era, that exquisite expression of a father's grief for his little Margaret called *The Pearl,* turns to the Apocalypse for a vision of the dwelling-place beyond the dark river that might have served Bunyan for the model of his Celestial City. Of even greater significance are the Miracle and Morality plays, which had their beginning during these years,—those wonderful animate illustrations of the sacred text that for two and a half centuries before Shakespeare served not only to develop the dramatic sense of the English populace, but to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

render vividly familiar to them the incident of the Bible and its ethical content.

During the latter part of the fourteenth century, English literature became not only more finished in form, but deeper and broader in spirit and content. The dominant figure of this period is Chaucer. In his work the influence of the Bible is patent, despite his intense reverence for the Italian masters. Besides minor Scriptural allusions and references, he has left as the most enduring of that wonderful portrait gallery of Canterbury Pilgrims the nobly inspiring picture of the Poor Parson. Moreover, this was the age of Langland and "Piers the Plowman." Hopelessly uncouth and confused as is "The Vision" to the modern reader, it was probably far more widely known at that time than was Chaucer's gallery of fourteenth-century worthies; and here one finds merely an elaborate symbol of the Christ story which concludes with a joyous ringing of the Easter Bells. A third figure of this age, whose importance in English literature is rarely recognized, is John Wyclif. Chaucer is commonly credited with having taken the fluid, rapidly changing English of the fourteenth century and given it definite form and comparative fixity. We seldom consider to what extent Wyclif's Bible, rather than "The Canterbury Tales," may be the real well of English undefiled which is the source of the speech of modern England. Chaucer wrote for a limited aristocratic circle, and his manuscripts circulated little outside the confines of the court. Wyclif wrote for the great body of middle-class Englishmen, and touched the life of the poorest peasant. His barefoot, russet-clad priests, wandering through the length and breadth of the land, carried with them their precious manuscript, bringing to their hearers the living truths in a living tongue and literally putting a new song into their mouths. The effects of the Lollard Movement on the English tongue cannot be easily estimated; and it is not surprising that, when at last the great inarticulate masses found a voice, its first utterance should be *The Pilgrim's Progress.*

The century and a half following the death of Chaucer in 1400, with its dreary record of literary achievement, was a period of preparation. The stream of English literature dived underground, to gather the power which should enable it to reissue during the latter Tudor period as a fountain of light, when in the mid-years of Elizabeth's reign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the genius of the English race burst full blossomed. The period of the Tudors was the great age of Biblical translation. In 1526 Tyndale gave his translation to the world; then, in rapid succession, appeared the translations of Coverdale and the Geneva scholars, the Great Bible of Cranmer, the Rheims and Douay versions, and others of less importance, culminating in the translation of 1611. In this last year appeared the Authorized Version; and England possessed one single great and enduring work of prose,—the noblest example of the English tongue, says John Richard Green, which from the instant of its appearance became the standard of our language. Before fifty years had passed, this book had made its way into the hearts of the English people; hundreds of its phrases had been absorbed bodily into the daily speech; and the combined simplicity, dignity, and music of its phrase had interpenetrated and become an essential element of English prose.

Before 1611, the influence noted had been that of the Bible rather than that of the English Bible. It had been largely due, at first, to a paucity of literary material and the influence of the Church upon the writers; then, to the deeply religious impulse that actuated the author. From this time on, the source of influence was to be largely a literary one; and we may pause to seek the reasons why this book should have affected so profoundly all of our nobler forms of letters,—our poetry, drama, fiction, oratory, and essays.

There are, inherent in the Bible, certain qualities, independent of translation, that make it a source of powerful emotional impulse. In the first place, its substance is essentially poetic. A considerable part of it is definitely lyrical, as in the Psalter and the numerous songs embedded in its narrative portions; an even larger part is filled with the ecstasy of vision, as in the prophetic books and the Apocalypse; its narratives have uniformly an epic or idyllic quality that is rarely found in secular history or fiction; its wisdom books and philosophical essays are never distinctively logical and constantly flash into purple passages that make their appeal solely to the feelings; even its stretches of law and ritual are filled with a warmth of color more in harmony with the scented pages of the poet than with the arid codes of the lawgiver. In the second place, this emotional pulsing is made more noticeable by the form of the Hebrew

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sentence, a quality that has been faithfully preserved in the translation. The Hebrew tongue is notably deficient in those subordinating particles which make possible the rolling periods of the Greek and the Latin. As a result, its sentences consist of single propositions that are short and vary little in length. This gives to its prose a rhythmic beat not unlike the swing of the verse in our poetic composition. A third striking quality of the Hebrew is its total lack of abstract words; hence, abstract thought and emotion can find expression only through concrete terms, and constant recourse is had to figurative language to make such expression possible. This quality may be illustrated by a single passage, the first three verses of the 69th Psalm:

> "Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into the deep waters, where the floods overflow me. I am weary of my crying: my throat is dried: my eyes fail while I wait for my God."

In this short passage, where the writer is attempting to convey the abstract idea of helpless despair, it is apparent how, by piling image on image and appealing always to the reader's senses and imagination, the writer wins a vividness and force that could never be his were the appeal directed only to the intellect.

Besides all this, it was the good fortune of the Bible to be translated into English at the only time in our history when these emotional qualities could have received adequate expression. At that time, the Anglo-Saxon element of the language had attained a complete development, and sufficient of the Latin had been absorbed directly or through the French to give this native element an added richness and harmony; but the language had not yet become filled with our present array of colorless abstract terms derived from classical sources. It, therefore, resembled the Hebrew in its constant recourse to concrete and figurative speech for the purpose of expressing abstractions. Through the translation of Tyndale, which is the basis of all the later important translations, the Authorized Version derives a special canorous quality from the Latin Vulgate; still, the directness, simplicity, concreteness, vigor, and dignity of the English Bible are essentially Anglo-Saxon. Moreover, the translators wrote at a time when English words still were shining symbols fresh from the mint of language and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not the mere "faded metaphors" that pass current among us to-day. Finally, the translators worked in that period when the religious conflict of England was most acute and intense. To Tyndale and Coverdale, translation was something far other than a literary exercise; their work was a service to God, involving the gravest eternal consequences; it was done in exile, with the fate of martyrdom full fronting them; and every line from their pen throbbed with the rhythm of heroic self-sacrifice and sublime devotion.

The literary period which wears the name of the Virgin Queen extends about twenty years on each side of the date of the Authorized Version, so that only about one-half of this period could have felt its influence; still, the popularity of the earlier translations was enormous, and it is at first glance surprising that their influence is so little seen in Elizabethan literature. It is true that Spenser's "Faerie Queene" is essentially an elaborate allegory of the soul's striving after perfection; and Bishop Wordsworth's careful examination of Shakespeare's plays reveals about one hundred and twenty definite allusions to the Bible. In these same plays, however, there are certainly an equal number of allusions to Law or Medicine or Navigation and a much larger number to Renaissance Italy; while among Shakespeare's contemporaries, with the exception of the philosophers and theologians, reference to the Bible is singularly lacking. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that the playwrights, who gave the most characteristic utterance to Elizabethan thought, were, because of their social condition, the class least likely to come under the influence of the Bible. A more adequate explanation seems that these Elizabethans were true children of the Renaissance, in thrall to the glamour of life and the glitter of its pageantry. Added to this was a new and vivid consciousness of their national greatness. These qualities led them naturally to seek their inspiration in the romantic pages of *Hakluyt's Voyages* and *Holinshed's Chronicles*, and especially in the numerous translations of the Italian *novelle* and Spanish rogue stories then newly come to England; and when, intoxicated with romance and patriotism, they turned to the ancients, it was the glow of Plutarch and Virgil, rather than the severer beauties of the Bible, that claimed their interest.

After the death of Elizabeth, the Bible underwent a grave misfortune. It ceased to be the book of a nation and became

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the tract of a sect, and that sect one which seems amazingly blind to its value as mere literature. Insisting upon a literal inspiration and devoting their energies to minute dissection of obscure texts, they lost the sense of its literary greatness; grubbing in dark corners and cobwebbed crypts, they lost sight of the grandeur of the whole edifice, through whose painted windows flamed the splendors of a glory eternal. Yet it must not be forgotten that this was the era of Bunyan and Milton. These two—one in prose, the other in verse—gave Puritanism its noblest expression; and both based this expression on the English Bible. *The Pilgrim's Progress* of the former became and remains the most widely known of English secular books. The *Paradise Lost* of the latter is, indeed, in a fair way to join the ranks of those classics which "every one praises and no one reads," but its influence persists in a way and to a degree that few realize; for it is Milton, and not Revelation, that has created the particular concepts of Hell and Heaven and Satan and God which even to-day are not infrequently accepted in the pew and taught from the pulpit. Nor must one forget the *Temple* of George Herbert and the *Noble Numbers* of Robert Herrick, or the quaint beauties of Giles Fletcher and the baffling music of John Donne, or the mystic passion of Crashaw and Henry Vaughan—incense wafted from the hallowed altars of their lives.

During the so-called Augustan Age, covering the last quarter of the seventeenth century and the first three-quarters of the eighteenth, English literature shows comparatively little influence of the Bible. This has been accounted for solely by the fact that the Puritans had monopolized it for their own purposes. This explanation seems hardly sufficient; the Bible is powerful enough to have surmounted this difficulty had not one more formidable lain in its way. This greater obstacle was the nature of the eighteenth-century literature. Whereas the Bible is simple, concrete, dignified, and profoundly emotional, the writing of the eighteenth century is artificial, abstract, trivial, and commonplace. The entire spirit of the century was antagonistic to that of the Bible; the writers were constitutionally incapable of feeling its appeal. It is true that Pope, the dominant figure of this era, bases one of his most popular poems, the "Messiah," on those passages in Isaiah foretelling the advent of Christ, and that in his "Universal Prayer," in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

terpenetrated as it is with Scriptural thought and phrase, he gives the profoundest expression of his personality; nor can we think of his deistic Essay on Man as possible without an existing Bible. It is true, moreover, that the story of Absalom's revolt furnishes Dryden with the framework of his best-known satire; that Swift's *Tale of a Tub* still divides favor with his *Gulliver's Travels;* that Addison's one real poem is his paraphrase of the 19th Psalm; that Goldsmith's most enduring creations are his gentle Vicar and his godly preacher of Fair Auburn; that Defoe and Samuel Richardson are often exasperatingly moralistic; and that Johnson's work is surcharged with a noble piety. Yet the only one of the great writers of this Augustan Age who shows any real influence of the English Bible is Edmund Burke. He, indeed, consciously modeled his majestic periods on the prose of the Authorized Version, and thereby wove for his thought a garment as richly broidered as the curtains of the Sanctuary. It is noteworthy, too, that the literature of this same eighteenth century is the least interesting and inspiring of any of the great periods of English letters.

Toward the close of the century came a return to naturalness and genuineness of feeling; and when Cowper sent John Gilpin galloping merrily down to Ware, he wrought a havoc among the staid traditions of the Augustans not unlike that accomplished upon the wash at Edmonton by his doughty rider. With this new birth of sincerity, the power of the great Book began once more to be felt. Scarcely one of the heralds of the dawn of Romanticism but reflects its glory,—not only Cowper with his wistful smile, but Crabbe painting his grim gray pictures of fortune's outcasts, Blake piping down his valleys wild, and Burns singing his new song of the worth of life's common things.

The dawn which Cowper and Burns heralded became full morning when the "Lyrical Ballads" of Wordsworth and Coleridge appeared in 1798; and in both of these poets the influence of the Bible is strikingly manifest. This appears primarily in the spirit of the New Testament which permeates all of Wordsworth's poetry; it shows more directly in frequent Biblical allusion and reference throughout his longer philosophical poems. Moreover, his journal tells specifically how deeply the stories of Elijah and Elisha influenced his great "Ode on the Intimations of Immortality."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It would be sufficient, however, to cite that splendid passage in the most familiar and characteristic of all his poems, "Tintern Abbey":

> "And I have felt
> A presence that disturbs me with the joy
> Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
> Of something far more deeply interfused,
> *Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,*
> *And the round ocean and the living air,*
> *And the blue sky,* and in the mind of man:
> A motion and a spirit, that impels
> All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
> And rolls through all things."

Here one finds a gorgeous paraphrase of the Psalmists:

> "O Lord my God, thou art very great; who coverest thyself with the light as with a garment; who stretchest out the heavens like a curtain; who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters; who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh upon the wings of the wind."

Nor is this influence on Coleridge less notable. Not only does it pervade his prose, but the one flawless poetic jewel in his narrow golden casket is essentially an elaborately beautiful application of Christ's "new commandment," save that Coleridge defines with a new and deeper meaning who is our "neighbor":

> "He prayeth best that loveth best
> All things—"

Byron, Shelley, and Keats, the three great poets who carried forward the work of Wordsworth and Coleridge, we should expect to show less powerfully the influence of the Bible,—the two former because of their antagonism toward the standards and ideals of their nation, and the last because of his aloofness from its problems. Still, when Byron seeks the most adequate expression of his personality, he goes to the story of Cain for his material, and his most widely known poems—though indeed not his greatest—are found among his "Hebrew Melodies." When Shelley writes his "Prometheus Unbound" as the final statement of his philosophical system, he merely retells the story of Golgotha under the guise of Greek myth. Even Keats, saturated though he is with the mythology of classic Greece

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the tales of Mediæval Europe, turns for his most rarely beautiful allusion to the idyl of *Ruth*. The three great essayists of this period are scarcely less imbued with this influence. Lamb shows this least. His whimsical mannerisms, indeed, seem at the farthest verge removed from the simplicity and directness of the English Bible; yet much of what is most enduring in his work is due to those echoes of other worldly music which he has derived through the confused medium of his master, Sir Thomas Browne. The most radiant passages of Hazlitt resound with the harmonies of the Authorized Version. And to realize De Quincey's indebtedness to the same source, one has only to read any dozen lines of his *Levana*:

> "This is he that once I made my darling. Him I led astray, him I beguiled, and from heaven I stole away his young heart to mine. Through me did he become idolatrous; and through me it was, by languishing desires, that he worshiped the worm and prayed to the wormy grave. Holy was the grave to him; lovely was its darkness; saintly its corruption. . . . See that thy scepter lie heavy on his head. Banish the frailties of hope; wither the relenting of love; scorch the fountain of tears; curse him as only thou canst curse. So shall he be accomplished in the furnace; so shall he see the things that ought not to be seen, sights that are abominable, and secrets that are unutterable. So shall he rise again before he dies."

Here one might almost be within the presence of the ecstasy of some old Hebrew prophet—a Jeremiah or an Ezekiel.

It was, however, not until the Victorian Age, the second of the great periods of English letters, that the Bible attained its greatest potency as a literary influence; and there are obvious reasons for this fact. The Victorian Age, as none other, was consciously humanitarian and moral in its aim; it was an age of profound seriousness, and sought to penetrate into the abysses of life and to search out its meaning; it was, above all, an age of deep and sincere emotion. The emotion of the Elizabethan was the emotion of the child,—sincere but unstable, amused with the brilliant surface of life and led hither and thither by the splendor of the passing moment; that of the man of the Romantic Revival and the French Revolution was the emotion of the adolescent,—intense but uncertain of its aim; that of the Victorian was the emotion of the adult,—grave and self-contained, and advancing slowly but consciously toward a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

well-defined if difficult ideal. These qualities drove the Victorian inevitably to the Bible as the ultimate expression of his spirit and ideals. This appears strikingly in the work of the three great essayists. As prophetic of the large use of Scriptural phrase that Macaulay was destined to make in his essays and addresses, one recalls his infant outburst against the maid who had disarranged the pebbles marking off his little garden: "Cursed be Sallie! For it is written, 'Cursed be he that removeth his neighbor's landmark.'" With what skill and power he later drew his weapons from the armory of the English Bible is illustrated in those terrible words wherein he sums up his indictment of Barère:

> "Whatsoever things are false, whatsoever things are dishonest, whatsoever things are unjust, whatsoever things are impure, whatsoever things are hateful, whatsoever things are of evil report, if there be any vice, and if there be any infamy, all these things, we knew, were blended in Barère."

In Carlyle this influence is even more patent; in fact, so imbued is he with the Hebraic intensity that we might easily believe him the Tishbite returned to earth to scourge with prophetic vehemence the abuses of a corrupt society. Ruskin shows the same influence differently but in no less degree. The germ of his social system is found in the Sermon on the Mount; and in his *Præterita* he himself traces the sources of his style to those long Old Testament chapters which he was required in childhood to commit to memory.

The two great masters of poetry bear equally conclusive testimony to the power of the Authorized Version. Tennyson has gone to the Bible but little for the subject matter of his poems; but how constantly he has drawn upon it for purposes of allusion appears in the fact that Dr. Van Dyke has found in these poems more than four hundred Biblical references. In Browning the number of allusions is even greater. A shorter poem like "Christmas Eve" and "Easter Day" contains no less than a hundred, while in "The Ring and the Book" there are almost one thousand, which are distributed over twenty-eight books of the Old Testament and twenty-five of the New. Moreover, many of his best known and greatest poems, as the "Epistle of Karshish" and "A Death in the Desert," are based directly on Biblical subjects.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An examination of the great novelists reveals the same truth. In thinking of Scott's novels, the story that one remembers with deepest sympathy is *The Heart of Midlothian*, that rare study of Scotch peasant life which stands so close to Burns's "The Cottar's Saturday Night"; but what is here concentrated appears in all the greater novels, especially in connection with those immortal studies of the Scotch peasantry. Even more striking is the use that Thackeray makes of the Bible in his great scenes. To every lover of Thackeray there are four of these that stand out most vividly in memory: the picture of Pendennis praying beside his dying mother; that of Amelia reading the story of Samuel to her boy on the night before his departure to his grandfather; that of Esmond, returned from the Spanish War, as he stands with Lady Castlewood beneath the moon which glitters keen in the frosty air, where through, like intertissued threads of gold, are woven the lofty harmonies of the 126th Psalm; and that most poignantly beautiful picture of all, where we stand at the bedside of Colonel Newcome, while his hand feebly beats time to the chapel bell, and hear that last spoken "Adsum" as he, "whose heart was as that of a little child," stands in the presence of his Master. We commonly think of Dickens as less influenced by the Bible than were these other two, and recall Mr. Chadband and Mr. Stiggins as typical of a cynical attitude toward religion. Yet Dickens himself ascribed to the Authorized Version whatever of excellence there was in his style; moreover, his sincere humanitarianism is a direct reflection of the spirit of the New Testament. To show this indebtedness, however, it is sufficient to recall that one scene which stands supreme in all his writings and to note how it is lifted into the sublime upon the organ music of St. John. I refer to the great final act of the *Tale of Two Cities*. With Sydney Carton the struggle is over,—love hath wrought its perfect work,—and he stands before the guillotine clasping the hand of the little seamstress:

"She kisses his lips; he kisses hers; they solemnly bless each other. The spare hand does not tremble as he releases it; nothing worse than a sweet, bright constancy is in the patient face. She goes next before him—is gone; the knitting women count Twenty-Two.

"'I am the Resurrection and the Life, saith the Lord: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The murmuring of many voices, the upturning of many faces, the pressing on of many footsteps in the outskirts of the crowd, so that it swells forward in a mass, like one great heave of water, all flashes away. Twenty-Three."

Since the passing of the great Victorians, English literature has moved on a lower plane,—how much lower may be judged from the deep twilight that followed the setting of Swinburne's lesser star. Its enormous increase in volume has been accompanied by a noticeable decrease in vitality. The orators and essayists are content to analyze and convince, and have forgot their power to create and inspire. The dramatists and writers of fiction have lost their sense of the universality of truth and human nature, and furnish only discussions of local and temporary problems or minute, often merely pathological, studies of individuals and narrow types. It is, however, in the poets that we feel most this decline in vigor. Other men of letters may give the plan of the battle, but it is the voice of the poet that calls us to action; the old legend of Tyrtæus is eternally and universally true. It is not that these more recent poets are mere spinners of bright-hued fancies; many of them are finished craftsmen and some inspired singers; but they lack the power to compel. Their voice is the voice of weakness. The burden of life is too heavy for them. They have ceased to summon us to the conflict; and though the fire of defiance still linger in their eye, they have laid their trumpets by and confessed defeat. Yet the influence of the Bible persists. Sometimes it is positive and direct, as in the stately harmonies of Kipling's "Recessional" or the labyrinthine beauties of Francis Thompson's "The Hound of Heaven"; sometimes, as in the extreme examples of James Thomson's "City of Dreadful Night" or John Davidson's "Ballad in Blank Verse," it appears only as an objective of revolt. During these latter years, as never before, the thought of man has journeyed afar into strange regions; yet throughout the range of our *belles lettres*,—our oratory, essays, novels, drama, and poetry,—the English Bible remains, as it has been, the source of truest and most enduring literary inspiration.

William Gilmer Perry.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PLACE OF THE SUSSEX MAN

BY FREDERICK ARTHUR HODGE

Much interest has recently been manifested in the discovery, by Mr. Charles Dawson, of part of the skull and mandible of an ancient man, near Pilt Down Common, Sussex, England. Workmen first found an object resembling a cocoanut, which curiosity led them to break in pieces, and, being unable to solve the mystery, they cast the pieces aside. Later a number of worked flints were found and laid out by the road-side. Mr. Dawson happening along saw these and was told of the cocoanut. He recovered the fragments and pieced them together to find that they formed the left half of a human skull. Subsequent search succeeded in bringing to light a fragment of the tooth of a mastodon; various fragments of the teeth of a prehistoric elephant, together with those of a hippopotamus, a beaver, and an extinct horse; a bit of a large deer's antler; and, finally, a fossilized jaw-bone which is presumed to belong to the same skull.

The gravel bed in which these remains were found represents a deposit made by the slow wearing away of chalky rocks in which the insoluble flint was originally embedded. Thus, erosion would bring together in the gravel deposit the remains of different periods if any such existed. It is the opinion, however, of Sir Ray Lankester and others that the remains are contemporary.

The place of this ancient ancestor in the roots of our family tree may be determined by a study of certain geological and anthropological factors. Geology recognizes four principal epochs in the development of terrestrial life.

EPOCHS	CHARACTERIZED BY
Primary or Palæozoic.	Seaweeds, ferns, and fishes.
Secondary or Mesozoic.	Conifers and reptiles.
Tertiary or Cainozoic.	Leaf-bearing trees and mammals.
Quaternary or Post-Tertiary.	Present existing species.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The last two periods are subdivided as follows:

Tertiary	Eocene.
	Oligocene.
	Miocene.
	Pliocene.
Quaternary	Pleistocene.
	Prehistoric and Recent.

The Eocene strata contain the earliest known mammalian types, while the earliest anthropoid apes are found in Miocene deposits. The life history of the human race will not, therefore, reach further back than the Miocene period.

Geography, climate, flora and fauna are important factors in the determination of ancestral place. If one could suddenly be transported to Sussex, and the wheels of time be as suddenly turned backward a million or more of years to Miocene and Pliocene times, he would be surprised at the strange outlines presented by the map of Europe and of England in particular. At that remote period the waves of the Atlantic washed upon a shore far to the west of the British Isles, which is now submerged beneath one hundred fathoms of water. The Irish Sea, the German Ocean, and the English Channel were then fertile valleys. The Thames flowed northward into the Rhine and finally into the Atlantic; while the Seine flowed westward along the now southern coast of Sussex, out through the fertile plains of the English Channel till it emptied into the Atlantic a hundred miles west of Land's End. In place of the Mediterranean were two inland seas separated by an isthmus which extended from Europe into Africa along the line of Italy and Sicily. The animals that inhabited the African jungles could thus cross into southern Europe and wander through the valleys of the Thames and Seine. Indeed, a traveler thus transported might well imagine that he stood in the midst of a great out-door menagerie. There were the huge proboscideans, the colossal Mastodon, and the Deinotherium, the latter having great tusks curving downward from the lower jaw. In the swamps he might be startled by the rush of the soft-nosed rhinoceros, which bore a horn sometimes three feet in length. Over the hills dash herds of wild horses about the size of sheep. The hippopotamus disports himself in the rivers while the formidable saber-toothed tiger steals through the tropical flora in pursuit of his victim.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Tropical flora"—not merely a rhetorical figure, for at that time water-lilies grew within eight degrees of the Pole. North Greenland had a flora of one hundred and thirty-seven described species, including conifers, beeches, oaks, planes, poplars, maples, walnuts, limes, and magnolias. But toward the end of the Pliocene period the gradual cooling of the climate which resulted in Pleistocene times, in the great Ice Age, caused the apes and many other mammals to seek a more southern habitat.

The "Cromer Forest-Bed" of Norfolk, England, is a late Pliocene deposit and gives a fair idea of the flora and fauna of its time. There are fifty-six varieties of flowering plants, the range of which indicates a mild and moist climate not unlike the England of to-day. Among the trees are the maple, hawthorn, elm, beech, birch, alder, hazel, oak, willow, yew, pine, and spruce. The fauna consists of species not so well known now. In fact, of the thirty large mammals found in the Forest-Bed only three are now living in Britain, and only six have survived in any part of the world. There were three species of elephants, the hippopotamus, rhinoceros, two types of horses one of which is now extinct, the bison, and the wild boar. Some flints bearing evidence of human workmanship were found here by Mr. W. J. L. Abbott in 1897. Altogether the stratified series, fauna and flints of the man of Sussex indicate that he represents approximately the same period as that of the Forest-Bed.

To state these periods in terms of years is admittedly very unsatisfactory. Geologists show the widest variation in their estimates. Nor does the evidence offered by the anthropologist remove many obstacles, but tends, rather, to make the problem more complex. Nevertheless, we are accustomed to think of time in terms of years, centuries, and millennia, and such estimates may at least encourage the imagination in a field where, undoubtedly, our greatest error is in falling short of, rather than over-reaching, reality. The figures used are those given by Mr. Arthur Keith, Conservator of the Museum, Royal College of Surgeons, England, in his recently published *Ancient Types of Man*. His estimate occupies a conservative middle ground among those commonly given.

Beginning with the present time and counting backward, the Metallic Period, characterized by the use of copper, bronze, and iron, extends over a period of about four thou-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sand years. This was preceded by an age in which finely polished stone implements were used. The Neolithic Period covered a stretch of at least twenty-five thousand years. Beyond the Neolithic we enter the Late Paleolithic, which extends over a period of one hundred and fifty thousand years to the end of the Glacial Age, and falls within the latter part of the geologists' Pleistocene Period. During this time man obtained mastery over stone. He learned to chip it with precision, forming implements that are notable both for their artistic beauty and their usefulness. The Early Paleolithic Period is estimated at anywhere from two hundred thousand to four hundred thousand years, and is characterized by crude stone implements. Beyond this for one hundred thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand years stretches the Eolithic Period, the dawn of the Stone Age. It is a vague and indistinct period for there is always a degree of uncertainty as to the evidences of human workmanship in chipping the flints. As the flint implements of this period were extremely primitive, it is an open question concerning most of the so-called "eoliths" as to whether Nature herself was not the great artificer. This is almost certainly the case with those flints found in the Upper Oligocene strata at Thenay, France. The period is too early for man, unless we suppose with G. De Mortillet that they represent the work of a semi-human precursor of both the apes and man. At this period the ancestral horse was a small-three-toed animal about eighteen inches high, and the ancestral elephant about the size of a pig. Moreover, chipped flints have been recently found in Lower Eocene sands at Belle Assize by the Abbé Breuil, which clearly showed that they owed their formation to movements of the strata settling under pressure of the upper earth. Some of these present an astonishing resemblance to the artificially formed "eoliths."

But whatever the doubts may be, it is rationally certain that long before the first crude stone implements, which clearly reveal human craftsmanship, were made, man had come to realize the necessity for some sharp-edged implements, and when nature failed to provide these he was slowly developing the art of producing them.

The stone implements and flints found in connection with the Sussex man belong to two different stages of culture. One series of flints are of "eolithic" origin, the other is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attributed to the " Chellean " stage, one of the Lower Paleolithic phases of development. The principal Chellean implement was a coarsely dressed piece of flint chipped on both sides to an irregular but sharp edge, and fitted for grasping in the hand without any shaft. It might be used either for scraping or cutting, and in the hands of this powerful creature who first fashioned it, would undoubtedly prove a formidable weapon. This weapon, for which Professor W. J. Sollas, of Oxford, proposes the name " boucher " in honor of its discoverer Boucher de Perthes, is the most common of the Chellean implements, being frequently the sole representative of the period. But the presence of such an implement does not of itself indicate the period at which it was used. The " boucher " held prominent place among the implements used in recent times by the Tasmanians. The presence of Chellean implements in the gravel in which the Sussex skull was found may be accounted for in a number of ways. The " eoliths " found in the same gravel are more in harmony with the strata and fauna both of which indicate a period earlier than that of Chellean man.

Summing up the figures given above the Eolithic and Paleolithic Periods of the anthropologist correspond roughly to the Pleistocene of the geologist, except that the Eolithic Period probably reaches farther back into the Pliocene times. The duration of the Pleistocene Period is estimated, by this count, at from four hundred and fifty thousand to seven hundred thousand years. Regarding the Sussex man as representing either Pliocene or the transition from it to Pleistocene times, would therefore fix his time at not less than five hundred thousand years ago.

Some comparisons between this skull and those of other ancient men are of interest. As a basis for such comparison, the cranial capacities of various modern races, representing so many stages from degeneracy to culture, are estimated as follows:

European	94	cubic	inches.
Negro	85	"	"
South African Bushman	78	"	"
Tasmanian	73	"	"
Australian Aborigine	72	"	"

The cranial capacity of the anthropoid apes is not known to exceed thirty-six cubic inches.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The celebrated Neanderthal man was discovered in 1857 in a Pleistocene bed in Feldhofen Cave, Neanderthal ravine, in Rhenish Prussia. The remains consisted of the brain cap, two femora, two humeri, and other fragments. Huxley pronounced the skull the most ape-like yet discovered, and estimated the cranial capacity at seventy-five cubic inches. This has since been disputed by Manouvrier and Boule, who estimate it to be equal to that of the average European of to-day. When these specimens were first exhibited before a meeting of German anthropologists at Bonn, their human character was doubted. Later the great anatomist, Virchow, expressed the opinion that the small size and peculiar shape of the brain cap were due to disease. Subsequent discoveries, however, show the Neanderthal man to have been a member of a race well distributed throughout Europe during the Glacial Period. Two almost complete skeletons which were recovered from the floor of a cave at Spy, Belgium; two others from Le Moustier and La Chapelle-aux-Saints; various fragments representing a dozen or more individuals from Krapina in Croatia; the Gibraltar cranium, which was discovered nine years before the Neanderthal remains; and the famous Heidelberg jaw, are among the remains that testify to the Neanderthal race. The implements found in connection with these remains serve to classify them as "Mousterien," a Middle Paleolithic stage. The Chellean "boucher" has given place to better prepared implements and also to a greater variety.

The Heidelberg jaw, probably the earliest trace of Neanderthal man, was found in 1907 in the valley of the Neckar, about six miles from the famous university town whose name it bears. It lay embedded in the sands of the ancient river Mauer, which are an early Pleistocene formation. In the same layer were found some bones and teeth of an extinct rhinoceros and an early kind of horse. The fauna is very similar to that of the Cromer Forest-Bed. While only the mandible of this ancient man was found, yet no single bone can reveal more concerning the body to which it belongs than a mandible. There is a striking resemblance between this Heidelberg jaw and that of the Sussex man, the latter, if anything, being the more primitive. The Sussex jaw is not quite complete, a portion of the front of the chin together with the incisors and canines being absent. But both these jaws show the absence of a chin, or, in other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words, they indicate a protruding muzzle as in the case of the anthropoid apes. While the dentition in each case is distinctly human, the massive body and broad ascending branches are as distinctively simian.

The free movements of the tongue in speech have been provided for in the existing races of man by a greater opening in the lower part of the jaw which bounds the floor of the mouth at its anterior extremity. The square chin allows the inner surface of the jaw to slope steeply downward from the back of the incisors. In the anthropoids this lingual basin is much encroached upon, the slope of the inner surface of the jaw being more gradual. In this respect both these ancient mandibles show an intermediate stage between man and the anthropoids. The jaw of the anthropoid is designed to serve simply the purpose of mastication. That of the human is modified to serve also in speech. In both these prehistoric men human speech of a primitive type may have been present, but we have reached a point in the development of the race where it may be said to be questionable.

The incompleteness of the Sussex skull renders estimates of the cranial capacity difficult, but it undoubtedly falls between sixty-two and sixty-seven cubic inches. Professor Keith attempts to reconstruct the whole head of the Heidelberg man on the basis of facts revealed by the mandible, and concludes that the cranial capacity was not less than one thousand three hundred cubic centimeters, or about seventy-eight cubic inches. Allowing for all possible inaccuracies in these figures, the man of Sussex shows smaller cranial capacity than that of any other European remains thus far discovered. In this respect he also represents a more primitive type of man than any existing race. But there is one other ancient man who probably antedated the Sussex man by as long a period as that between the latter and the Neanderthal race.

In 1891 and '92, Dr. Eugène Dubois, Professor of Geology at the University of Amsterdam, uncovered on the bank of a stream in central Java the bones of twenty-seven species of mammals. Among these were a skull-cap, thigh-bone, and two molars, which he assigned to an extinct animal type and named it *Pithecanthropus erectus* (Erect Man-ape). In general form and scientific detail, clear only to the trained eye of the anatomist and anthropologist, this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skull-cap is more simian than human. The forehead is more receding than that of the chimpanzee. The height of skull, according to Keith, is only seventy-nine millimeters, twenty millimeters less than that of the modern European, and only thirteen millimeters more than that of the male gorilla. Professor Dubois estimates the cranial capacity of the Java man as eight hundred and fifty cubic centimeters, or about fifty-two cubic inches. It must be remembered, however, that the skull is far too incomplete for exact measurement. If the above measurements are correct, the Java man occupies a position, in this respect, midway between the anthropoid apes and the lowest existing races of men. There seems to be a striking concurrence here between the figures of Keith and those of Dubois, and the former believes that the time of the Java man was near the beginning of the Pliocene Period.

Arranging these remains of prehistoric man in order of age, the Java man would occupy first place at not less than a million years antiquity. Next would come the Sussex man as the oldest European yet found. As the Java man forms a link midway between man and the apes, so the Sussex man forms a no less important link between *Pithecanthropus* and modern man, while the gap between the man of Sussex and our own times is filled first by the Heidelberg man and then by the other Neanderthal representatives.

These occasional discoveries are forging link by link the living chain that connects us with the remote past. They indicate that back in Miocene times the parent stock began to differentiate into those two great lines which are to-day so far apart, man and the man-like apes. The advance of man has required not years, but millennia. We rise from a stooping posture without a thought of how our distant ancestors through the advance of ages untold, gradually attained the erect posture. We light our fires with a chemically prepared stick costing a penny a box, and value not the priceless gift of Prometheus. But the erect posture, the use of fire, the development of speech, the fashioning of crude implements, the taming of the wild horse, and the reproduction at will of the wild plants, are milestones along the pathway of progress which dimly and vaguely indicate the distance man has come.

FREDERICK ARTHUR HODGE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POLITICAL SIDE OF STATE OWNERSHIP IN FRANCE

BY THEODORE STANTON

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW has recently published, from the pen of two distinguished Frenchmen who speak with authority on whatever they treat, two notable articles on Government ownership of public utilities. I refer to M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche.

In his special field, that of the old classic system of political economy, M. Leroy-Beaulieu stands first in France, if not in Europe. His intellectual force is questioned by no one. He is a Member of the Institute, Professor of Political Economy at the Collège de France, founder and editor of the *Economiste Français,* and President of the Society of Political Economists, whose interesting monthly meetings he presides over with the greatest courtesy and ability. Son of a Prefect of the Orleans Monarchy, son-in-law of a Senator of the Second Empire, and father of the present Conservative deputy for Montpellier, he is naturally not in full sympathy with the democratic Republic which is taking firmer root in France with each succeeding year, and his views on public questions do not always reflect exactly the state of mind of the people and the condition of things in his country. The facts themselves are correct enough, but the atmosphere which surrounds them is sometimes overcharged.

M. Jules Roche, like M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, is of conservative origin, but unlike the latter, he has gone through a period of advanced Radicalism, only to return at the close of life to his starting-point. Nephew of a Catholic Bishop and educated at the well-known ultra-Catholic Stanislas College of Paris, he early wandered from the fold, opposed the Second Empire in its last years, welcomed ardently the New Republic, and joined the editorial staff of *La Justice,*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the organ of Clemenceau, when the latter was leader of the Extreme Left in the Chamber of Deputies. On entering the Paris Municipal Council, he took a seat among the most advanced members and by speech and vote showed a strong antipathy for the priesthood; and later, in the Chamber and while Minister, he continued to be one of the most radical of the Radicals. But to-day, M. Jules Roche has destroyed all the political idols of his early manhood, and has become perhaps the most pronounced, as he certainly is one of the most intellectual, of the Jeremiahs of the Third Republic, which, however, does not prevent him from standing high, as also does M. Leroy-Beaulieu, in the esteem of political and financial circles outside of his own country, where of course both are prophets without honor. When the Prince of Monaco needed a constitution for his Principality, he turned instinctively to his friend Jules Roche to draw it up for him, and when the Kaiser learned that Jules Roche, who is as fond of music as of constitutional law, was in Berlin, he invited him to the Imperial box at the Opera. Nor did it surprise anybody last summer in Paris that Jules Roche lunched once each week with the young Prince of Wales and acted as a sort of honorary preceptor in the department of political science to the future King of England.

In writing of a democratic Republic, it is only natural, therefore, that M. Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche should display a certain political bias, and it is only proper that the foreign reader, whose prime wish is to be absolutely correctly informed, should be put on his guard against this bias. This is the purpose of the present article; and it is hoped that the student of the question of State ownership in France may rise from the perusal of these three articles with a fairly exact idea of the situation. With this end in view, I have next to nothing to add to or take away from the economic and philosophical presentation of the subject as given by M. Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche, who have made out a very strong case against State interference with the individual, so strong in fact that I may put away additional facts of my own which bear out their various contentions, though I cannot refrain from calling attention to the congress held last spring by the workmen of the State match factories, where, among other demands, was one for shorter hours, based on the over-stock of matches. But the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Journal des Débats very pertinently asked whether the same result might not be attained, and with profit to the public treasury, if the number of workmen was reduced! Then, there is the quite recent apostasy of Professor Henry Berthélemy, of the Paris Law School. In the preface to the seventh edition, just issued, of his standard *Treatise on Administrative Law,* the learned author, who heretofore has always been a firm advocate of a State railway system, declares that, though theoretically he still holds the same opinion, he is now forced to admit that in practice it is bad. But perhaps the best and most impartial, as it is also the most recent, presentation of the whole subject, not only in France but the world over, is to be found in the volume of that veteran French political economist, M. Yves Guyot, *La Gestion par l'Etat et les Municipalités.*

Nor is it necessary for me to point out here and there in the articles already mentioned a slight over-darkening of the picture and the neglect to offer now and then some extenuating circumstances, especially in the case of the Western Railway under State management. I think every unbiased observer of contemporary French history will be ready to admit that the discussion as presented by M. Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche is substantially correct. The cold facts of the first and the fervent philosophy of the second are a just and powerful arraignment of the State in its baneful policy of meddling with the economic and industrial interests of France. This being the case, the average reader might conclude, especially as M. Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche in the ardor of their apostleship sometimes seem to leave that impression, that a change is about to take place in France in these matters. But the aim of this article is precisely to show that this is not to happen.

M. Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche are both very severe on the Radical party, the *bête noire* of the Conservatives of France. The former even fixes the date of its advent and, as he supposes, its final exit from power. But to an outside observer on the spot, it is evident that this view is largely due to the wish being father to the thought. That the Radical party, or what it would be more correct to say, one branch of the Radical party, has received a momentary setback is quite true; but to conclude therefrom that the ideas which this party stands for, viz., a whole series of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

necessary democratic reforms, are killed and indefinitely adjourned would be a grave mistake. A very thoughtful Paris solicitor, M. Michel Milhaud, rightly says in a pamphlet entitled "*Le Collectivisme,*" which he has just brought out, that "the Third Republic is not abreast of the monarchial countries in its democratic reforms," a charge, by the way, which has often been made against our own Republic. What is going to occur in France, what is in fact occurring at the moment of writing, is what happens in all healthy constitutional countries—the ins are going out and the outs are coming in; that is all, or about all, that is taking place in the home politics of France. The nation is still ruled, and will continue to be ruled, by Republicans, and, as far as their tenets go, by radical Republicans too. In a word, there is to be a change of persons, which is always good in politics, rather than a change of policies. The ideas and programme of the outgoing Radicals are the ideas and programme of the incoming Radicals of a milder shade. It is the case to repeat with the witty Alphonse Karr, "The more it changes, the more it is the same thing."

There is another and perhaps even stronger reason why the foreign reader of these two articles must not conclude that, because of its failures and evils, State interference is going to cease in France. Government in that country, under all the different régimes, has ever been very strongly centralized, and under the Third Republic this tendency has perhaps increased in practice if not in spirit. The people are becoming there more and more the masters, as in all republics, and are the more willing to be ruled by the central government as it becomes more and more their creation and their creature. If this change is very perceptible to-day in a federative Republic like the United States, it is of course all the more marked in France where the federative principle received its death blow at the upheaval of 1789. In a nation where the Minister of Public Instruction once proudly declared that he knew what every boy and girl in France was studying at any hour of any day in the year, and where the Minister of the Interior has his hand on even the *garde champêtre* of every one of the more than 36,000 *communes*, it goes without saying that in such a land "*Etatisme*" will flourish like a green bay tree; and whether the powers that be are Monarchists, Imperialists, Republicans, or Socialists,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they will all repeat and act upon the saying of Louis XIV., "*L'Etat, c'est moi.*"

A third and not less weighty reason why this policy is to continue is found in the fact that, since the advent of the Third Republic, French democracy has made the greatest forward strides in its history; and now that it is getting more and more strongly intrenched in power, it does not intend to stand still, much less draw back, but of course proposes to go on until the whole work cut out by the Radical party, to say nothing of the dreams of the Socialists, is accomplished. M. Léon Bourgeois, one of the leaders of the Radicals and until the other day Minister of Labor, sums up the programme in these words: "As regards State intervention, the rule should be,—never more than is just, never more than is useful, but as much as is just and as much as is useful." In other words, in France the State will in the future have more to do than it has ever had in the past. The truth of this assertion becomes still more evident if we glance for a moment at some of the things which the French State has done during the last quarter of a century. *Ab uno disce omnes.*

In 1891 was introduced into French criminal procedure what is perhaps the most humanitarian reform known to the French courts and which especially benefits the lower orders of society. I refer to the *Loi Béranger*, or the First Offenders' Act, an innovation that is still warmly approved after a quarter-century's trial. Legislation in the interests of women, children, and old men has been very active during the past twenty-five years. Never before as at present have labor laws occupied so much of the time of the French Parliament and with such practical and far-reaching results. Free speech, free press, and freedom of association have succeeded to the illiberal laws on these subjects in practice during the Second Empire. The separation of Church and State, though some of the provisions of this grand measure were adversely and often unfairly criticized in certain quarters, is approved to-day by a vast—I use the word advisedly—majority of the French people. Nobody in France who thinks and says what he really thinks would ask for a restoration of the Concordat, any more than an American would favor the rescinding, if this were possible, of Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation. M. Briand's radical measure gave a fresh strength to the policy of State interference in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters affecting the individual that all the wild schemes, however utilitarian, of M. Jean Juarès cannot weaken.

Nor do the lower classes of France forget that free, unsectarian primary schools came in the eighties from the Republican State, and especially from the then advanced wing of the Republican party, the more moderate element following in the wake, as usual when a popular measure is up for action. Figures count in France, as elsewhere, particularly when read by the hard-headed French peasantry and the quick-witted city working-man, who know—and the Republican leaders are careful not to let them forget it—that, whereas in the last years of the Second Empire only thirty-six millions of francs were devoted to public instruction, to-day, notwithstanding the terrible financial strain caused by the immense war and navy appropriations, the figures are some two hundred and seventy-five millions.

A similar evidence of State interest under a republic in the welfare of the people is seen in the present military organization of France. Thus, in 1870, a second lieutenant was paid one thousand eight hundred and fifty francs a year, or about three hundred and sixty dollars. To-day, he receives two thousand three hundred and forty francs. In 1870, a colonel's pay was six thousand francs, which is about what an Instructor gets in our American universities, and though it is still too low, especially when compared with the American army, it is now eight thousand one hundred and thirty-six francs. And at this very moment a special committee, appointed by the present Minister of War, is drawing up a new bill which is to raise still higher the pay of officers and non-commission officers too. Under the Second Empire, the common soldier's meat ration was two hundred and fifty grammes per day; under the Republic, it is three hundred and twenty grammes. At the beginning of the Third Republic, the mortality in the army was 9.7 for every one thousand men. Now it is less than 4. And crowning all in this category was the law passed on March 21, 1905, which covers a multitude of Radical party sins, at least in the popular eye, where, by the way, it has not very many. The text of this law runs as follows: " Every Frenchman must serve in the army. All are treated alike. No exemptions are made except for physical incapacity." Never until then had the democracy of modern France obtained equal treatment in the national army.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But what most habituates the State to interfere in the life of the French citizen and most habituates the French citizen to accept this interference without protest and, in many cases, even to welcome it, is unquestionably the *modus operandi* of the French electoral system. I do not refer here to the manner of dividing the spoils after an election or to the results expected from the new proportional representation bill, if it ever becomes law. What I have in mind is the way elections are conducted by the State, represented by that arch Boss, the Minister of the Interior, in whose presence our American bosses, in so far as they manipulate things at the polls, are as mere pigmies. Though voters to-day do not deposit their ballots in the coat pocket of the mayor, as was sometimes the case during the Second Empire, the Minister of the Interior and his minions have now as then the upper hand in all that pertains to receiving and counting ballots and announcing results. The ancient machinery of the sentimental days of 1848, when universal suffrage was established in France, bent to the evil ways of the cynical Second Empire, has been preserved and is still used by the Third Republic. In fact, the Republican party finds the domination as serviceable as did the unscrupulous Imperialists, and there appears to be no desire to do away with the crying abuses. The deleterious effect on public opinion of this slavery to the State in electoral matters cannot be exaggerated, and it shows itself in France in various ways. Perhaps no nation is so abject as is the French in the presence of officialdom. It is one of the characteristics of all classes of the people that most astonishes the American and English traveler in France, and is unquestionably largely due to the excessive and unblushing manipulation of universal suffrage by the party in power. State ownership of a railway or a mine seems natural and almost trivial to a public accustomed to contemplate the State controlling the creation of Parliament.

And what are the reforms which the French Republicans are expecting the State still to confer on the nation? They believe with Bastiat that "the ideal sought for should be the harmonizing of all legitimate interests," but they are not all of one mind as to what these "interests" are or how these interests can best be harmonized. Some of the reforms demanded fall, with general consent, within the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinarily accepted competence of the State, whereas others are closely allied to the Collectivist doctrine. These desiderata, in so far as they are connected with the economic side of the problem, which is of course the crux of the whole business, are perhaps best summed up by M. Michel Milhaud in the pamphlet already referred to. "The question," he says, "is not between capital, labor, and the State; it concerns only capital and labor," and he then defines his system as "the legal intervention of the State," the point where all French reformers of every school seem to meet. And here is what M. Milhaud thinks the State should still further do:

1. As there are trades in which the worker does not earn a living, the law should fix a minimum wage. 2. As the workman does not receive a fair share of the profits, the law should see that he gets a right return for his labor. 3. A man must live, and consequently the Legislature should exempt from taxation those whom the cost of living renders incapable of paying any. 4. The law should strike a balance between the cost and profit of the different professions, and should tax the remunerative and exempt the unremunerative ones. Thus, trusts and stock-exchange transactions, which have to do with millions and great enterprises, should be taxed in proportion to the importance of the affair. 5. The law should establish a system of professional education fitted to the new economic conditions, an education whose special aim should be to point out the unsurmountable difficulties, due to economic changes, which mark certain callings.

And M. Milhaud closes his pamphlet with these commentaries, which are particularly worthy of attention as being a very good sample of the thoughts now prevalent among the Radicals of France, on his five propositions:

"There must be free play for all—for individuals, groups, associations, and syndicates. But the respective rights of everybody must be protected by the law. There must be no strangling of anybody. Though every man must be left free to rise to the top, he must not be permitted to crush others in so doing. Everybody must be given a 'square deal.' The law must see to it that a man can live and that he gets a fair return for his labor, and should provide an education in keeping with the needs of life and the new economic conditions. It is the right and the duty of the law to act as arbitrator. In order to carry on the public services, it will collect its revenues from those in a position to contribute thereto."

In a country where one of its most original thinkers—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Saint Simon (I refer to the Count and not to the Duke, to the nephew and not to the uncle)—advanced a tenet which has always been very popular in his native land and never more so than to-day, viz., that "all citizens should be office-holders," it is not probable that the nation will give ear to Emerson's very true dictum, found in his essay on politics, that "the State must follow and not lead the character and progress of the citizen." Among Frenchmen of to-day thoughtful minds like those of M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu and M. Jules Roche may condemn State interference in every form, but they well know that the whole tendency of modern government, especially in democracies and particularly in France, is toward what Laboulaye, whom M. Roche so justly praises, cleverly deprecates in his famous book on the United States, which ranks with those of de Tocqueville and Bryce, though, unlike those remarkable expounders of American institutions, he never was in our country. Here is what Laboulaye, in *Paris en Amérique*, puts into the mouth of one of his American characters:

"The more democratic a people is, the more is it necessary that the individual be strong and his property sacred. We are a nation of sovereigns, and everything that weakens the individual tends toward demagogy, that is, toward disorder and ruin; whereas everything that fortifies the individual tends toward democracy, that is, the reign of reason and the Evangel. A free country is a country where each citizen is absolute master of his conscience, his person, and his goods. If the day ever comes when individual rights are swallowed up by those of the general interest, that day will see the end of Washington's handiwork; we will be a mob and we will have a master."

These lines were written when we were in the midst of our Civil War, but are perhaps more apropos to-day than they were just half a century ago.

THEODORE STANTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EXPERIMENTS IN GOVERNMENT AND THE ESSENTIALS OF THE CONSTITUTION.—II.

BY THE HONORABLE ELIHU ROOT, UNITED STATES SENATOR

In the first of these lectures I specified certain essential characteristics of our system of government, and discussed the preservation of the first—its representative character. The four other characteristics specified have one feature in common. They all aim to preserve rights by limiting power.

Of these the most fundamental is the preservation in our Constitution of the Anglo-Saxon idea of individual liberty. The republics of Greece and Rome had no such conception. All political ideas necessarily concern man as a social animal, as a member of society—a member of the State. The ancient republics, however, put the State first and regarded the individual only as a member of the State. They had in view the public rights of the State in which all its members shared, and the rights of the members as parts of the whole, but they did not think of individuals as having rights independent of the State, or against the State. They never escaped from the attitude toward public and individual civil rights which was dictated by the original and ever-present necessity of military organization and defense.

The Anglo-Saxon idea, on the other hand, looked first to the individual. In the early days of English history, without theorizing much upon the subject, the Anglo-Saxons began to work out their political institutions along the line expressed in our Declaration of Independence, that the individual citizen has certain inalienable rights—the right to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness, and that government is not the source of these rights, but is the instrument for the preservation and promotion of them. So when a century and a half after the Conquest the barons of Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land set themselves to limit the power of the Crown they did not demand a grant of rights. They asserted the rights of individual freedom and demanded observance of them, and they laid the corner-stone of our system of government in this solemn pledge of the Great Charter:

> "No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or be disseized of his free hold, or his liberties, or his free customs, or be outlawed, or exiled, or otherwise destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land."

Again and again in the repeated confirmations of the Great Charter, in the Petition of Rights, in the Habeas Corpus Act, in the Bill of Rights, in the Massachusetts Body of Liberties, in the Virginia Bill of Rights, and, finally, in the immortal Declaration of 1776—in all the great utterances of striving for broader freedom which have marked the development of modern liberty, sounds the same dominant note of insistence upon the inalienable right of individual manhood under government, but independent of government, and, if need be, against government, to life and liberty.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of the consequences which followed from these two distinct and opposed theories of government. The one gave us the dominion, but also the decline and fall, of Rome. It followed the French Declaration of the Rights of Man, with the negation of those rights in the oppression of the Reign of Terror, the despotism of Napoleon, the popular submission to the Second Empire, and the subservience of the individual citizen to official superiority which still prevails so widely on the continent of Europe. The tremendous potency of the other subdued the victorious Normans to the conquered Saxon's conception of justice, rejected the claims of divine right by the Stuarts, established capacity for self-government upon the independence of individual character that knows no superior but the law, and supplied the amazing formative power which has molded, according to the course and practice of the common law, the thought and custom of the hundred millions of men drawn from all lands and all races who inhabit this continent north of the Rio Grande.

The mere declaration of a principle, however, is of little avail unless it be supported by practical and specific rules of conduct through which the principle shall receive effect. So Magna Charta imposed specific limitations upon royal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

authority to the end that individual liberty might be preserved, and so to the same end our Declaration of Independence was followed by those great rules of right conduct which we call the limitations of the Constitution. Magna Charta imposed its limitations upon the kings of England and all their officers and agents. Our Constitution imposed its limitations upon the sovereign people and all their officers and agents, excluding all the agencies of popular government from authority to do the particular things which would destroy or impair the declared inalienable right of the individual.

Thus the Constitution provides: No law shall be made by Congress prohibiting the free exercise of religion, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated. No person shall be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor be compelled, in any criminal case, to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation. In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed; and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation, to be confronted with the witnesses against him, to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishment inflicted. The privilege of the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, except in case of rebellion or invasion. No bill of attainder or ex post facto law shall be passed. And by the Fourteenth Amendment, no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.

We have lived so long under the protection of these rules that most of us have forgotten their importance. They have been unquestioned in America so long that most of us have forgotten the reasons for them. But if we lose them

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

we shall learn the reasons by hard experience. And we are in some danger of losing them, not all at once, but gradually, by indifference.

As Professor Sohm says: "The greatest and most far-reaching revolutions in history are not consciously observed at the time of their occurrence."

Every one of these provisions has a history. Every one stops a way through which the overwhelming power of government has oppressed the weak individual citizen, and may do so again if the way be opened. Such provisions as these are not mere commands. They withhold power. The instant any officer, of whatever kind or grade, transgresses them he ceases to act as an officer. The power of sovereignty no longer supports him. The majesty of the law no longer gives him authority. The shield of the law no longer protects him. He becomes a trespasser, a despoiler, a law-breaker, and all the machinery of the law may be set in motion for his restraint or punishment. It is true that the people who have made these rules may repeal them. As restraints upon the people themselves they are but self-denying ordinances which the people may revoke, but the supreme test of capacity for popular self-government is the possession of that power of self-restraint through which a people can subject its own conduct to the control of declared principles of action.

These rules of constitutional limitation differ from ordinary statutes in this, that these rules are made impersonally, abstractly, dispassionately, impartially, as the people's expression of what they believe to be right and necessary for the preservation of their idea of liberty and justice. The process of amendment is so guarded by the Constitution itself as to require lapse of time and opportunity for deliberation and consideration and the passing away of disturbing influences which may be caused by special exigencies or excitements before any change can be made. On the contrary, ordinary acts of legislation are subject to the considerations of expediency for the attainment of the particular objects of the moment, to selfish interests, momentary impulses, passions, prejudices, temptations. If there be no general rules which control particular action, general principles are obscured or set aside by the desires and impulses of the occasion. Our knowledge of the weakness of human nature and countless illustrations from the history of legis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lation in our own country point equally to the conclusion that if governmental authority is to be controlled by rules of action, it cannot be relied upon to impose those rules upon itself at the time of action, but must have them prescribed for it beforehand.

The second class of limitations upon official power provided in our Constitution prescribe and maintain the distribution of power to the different departments of government and the limitations upon the officers invested with authority in each department. This distribution follows the natural and logical lines of the distinction between the different kinds of power—legislative, executive, and judicial. But the precise allotment of power and lines of distinction are not so important as it is that there shall be distribution, and that each officer shall be limited in accordance with that distribution, for without such limitations there can be no security for liberty. If whatever great officer of State happens to be the most forceful, skilful, and ambitious is permitted to overrun and absorb to himself the powers of all other officers and to control their action, there ensues that concentration of power which destroys the working of free institutions, enables the holder to continue himself in power, and leaves no opportunity to the people for a change except through a revolution. Numerous instances of this very process are furnished by the history of some of the Spanish-American Republics. It is of little consequence that the officer who usurps the power of others may design only to advance the public interest and to govern well. The system which permits an honest and well-meaning man to do this will afford equal opportunity for selfish ambition to usurp power in its own interest. Unlimited official power concentrated in one person is despotism, and it is only by carefully observed and jealously maintained limitations upon the power of every public officer that the workings of free institutions can be continued.

The rigid limitation of official power is necessary not only to prevent the deprivation of substantial rights by acts of oppression, but to maintain that equality of political condition which is so important for the independence of individual character among the people of the country. When an officer has authority over us only to enforce certain specific laws at particular times and places, and has no authority regarding anything else, we pay deference to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law which he represents, but the personal relation is one of equality. Give to that officer, however, unlimited power, or power which we do not know to be limited, and the relation at once becomes that of an inferior to a superior. The inevitable result of such a relation long continued is to deprive the people of the country of the individual habit of independence. This may be observed in many of the countries of Continental Europe, where official persons are treated with the kind of deference, and exercise the kind of authority, which are appropriate only to the relations between superior and inferior.

So the Massachusetts Constitution of 1780, after limiting the powers of each department to its own field, declares that this is done "to the end it may be a government of laws and not of men."

The third class of limitations I have mentioned are those made necessary by the novel system which I have described as superimposing upon a federation of State governments a national government acting directly upon the individual citizens of the States. This expedient was wholly unknown before the adoption of our Constitution. All the confederations which had been attempted before that time were simply leagues of States, and whatever central authority there was derived its authority from, and had its relations with the States, as separate bodies politic. This was so of the old Confederation. Each citizen owed his allegiance to his own State and each State had its obligations to the Confederation. Under our constitutional system in every part of the territory of every State there are two sovereigns, and every citizen owes allegiance to both sovereigns—to his State and to his nation. In regard to some matters, which may generally be described as local, the State is supreme. In regard to other matters, which may generally be described as national, the nation is supreme. It is plain that to maintain the line between these two sovereignties operating in the same territory and upon the same citizens is a matter of no little difficulty and delicacy. Nothing has involved more constant discussion in our political history than questions of conflict between these two powers, and we fought the great Civil War to determine the question whether in case of conflict the allegiance to the State or the allegiance to the nation was of superior obligation. We should observe that the Civil War arose because the Con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stitution did not draw a clear line between the national and State powers regarding slavery. It is of very great importance that both of these authorities, State and national, shall be preserved together and that the limitations which keep each within its proper province shall be maintained. If the power of the States were to override the power of the nation we should ultimately cease to have a nation and become only a body of really separate, although confederated, State sovereignties continually forced apart by diverse interests and ultimately quarreling with one another and separating altogether. On the other hand, if the power of the nation were to override that of the States and usurp their functions, we should have this vast country, with its great population, inhabiting widely separated regions, differing in climate, in production, in industrial and social interests and ideas, governed in all its local affairs by one all-powerful, central government at Washington, imposing upon the home life and behavior of each community the opinions and ideas of propriety of distant majorities. Not only would this be intolerable and alien to the idea of free self-government, but it would be beyond the power of a central government to do directly. Decentralization would be made necessary by the mass of government business to be transacted, and so our separate localities would come to be governed by delegated authority—by proconsuls authorized from Washington to execute the will of the great majority of the whole people. No one can doubt that this also would lead by its different route to the separation of our Union. Preservation of our dual system of government, carefully restrained in each of its parts by the limitations of the Constitution, has made possible our growth in local self-government and national power in the past, and, so far as we can see, it is essential to the continuance of that government in the future.

All of these three classes of constitutional limitations are therefore necessary to the perpetuity of our government. I do not wish to be understood as saying that every single limitation is essential. There are some limitations that might be changed and something different substituted. But the system of limitation must be continued if our governmental system is to continue—if we are not to lose the fundamental principles of government upon which our Union is maintained and upon which our race has won the liberty secured by law for which it has stood foremost in the world.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lincoln covered this subject in one of his comprehensive statements that cannot be quoted too often. He said in his First Inaugural:

> "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiment is the only true sovereign of a free people. Whoever rejects it does of necessity fly to anarchy or despotism."

Rules of limitation, however, are useless unless they are enforced. The reason for restraining rules arises from a tendency to do the things prohibited. Otherwise no rule would be needed. Against all practical rules of limitation —all rules limiting official conduct—there is a constant pressure from one side or the other. Honest differences of opinion as to the extent of power, arising from different points of view make this inevitable, to say nothing of those weaknesses and faults of human nature which lead men to press the exercise of power to the utmost under the influence of ambition, of impatience with opposition to their designs, of selfish interest and the arrogance of office. No mere paper rules will restrain these powerful and common forces of human nature. The agency by which, under our system of government, observance of constitutional limitation is enforced is the judicial power. The Constitution provides that "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding." Under this provision an enactment by Congress not made in pursuance of the Constitution, or an enactment of a State contrary to the Constitution, is not a law. Such an enactment should strictly have no more legal effect than the resolution of any private debating society. The Constitution also provides that the judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States. Whenever, therefore, in a case before a Federal court rights are asserted under or against some law which is claimed to violate some limitation of the Constitution, the court is obliged to say whether the law does violate the Constitution or not, because if it does not violate the Constitution the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

court must give effect to it as law, while if it does violate the Constitution it is no law at all and the court is not at liberty to give effect to it. The courts do not render decisions like imperial rescripts declaring laws valid or invalid. They merely render judgment on the rights of the litigants in particular cases, and in arriving at their judgment they refuse to give effect to statutes which they find clearly not to be made in pursuance of the Constitution and therefore to be no laws at all. Their judgments are technically binding only in the particular case decided; but the knowledge that the court of last resort has reached such a conclusion concerning a statute, and that a similar conclusion would undoubtedly be reached in every case of an attempt to found rights upon the same statute, leads to a general acceptance of the invalidity of the statute.

There is only one alternative to having the courts decide upon the validity of legislative acts, and that is by requiring the courts to treat the opinion of the legislature upon the validity of its statutes, evidenced by their passage, as conclusive. But the effect of this would be that the legislature would not be limited at all except by its own will. All the provisions designed to maintain a government carried on by officers of limited powers, all the distinctions between what is permitted to the national government and what is permitted to the State governments, all the safeguards of the life, liberty, and property of the citizen against arbitrary power, would cease to bind Congress, and on the same theory they would cease also to bind the legislatures of the States. Instead of the Constitution being superior to the laws, the laws would be superior to the Constitution, and the essential principles of our government would disappear. More than one hundred years ago, Chief Justice Marshall, in the great case of Marbury *vs.* Madison, set forth the view upon which our government has ever since proceeded. He said:

"The powers of the legislature are defined and limited; and that those limits may not be mistaken or forgotten, the Constitution is written. To what purpose are powers limited, and to what purpose is that limit committed to writing, if these limits may, at any time, be passed by those intended to be restrained? The distinction between a government with limited and unlimited powers is abolished, if those limits do not confine the persons on whom they are imposed, and if acts prohibited and acts allowed are of equal obligation. It is a proposition too plain to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contested, that the Constitution controls any legislative act repugnant to it; or that the legislature may alter the Constitution by an ordinary act.

"Between these alternatives, there is no middle ground. The Constitution is either a superior, paramount law, unchangeable by ordinary means, or it is on a level with ordinary legislative acts, and, like other acts, is alterable when the legislature shall please to alter it. If the former part of the alternative be true, then a legislative act, contrary to the Constitution, is not law: if the latter part be true, then written constitutions are absurd attempts, on the part of the people, to limit a power, in its own nature, illimitable.

"Certainly, all those who have framed written constitutions contemplate them as forming the fundamental and paramount law of the nation, and consequently, the theory of every such government must be, that an act of the legislature, repugnant to the Constitution, is void. This theory is essentially attached to a written constitution, and is, consequently, to be considered by this court as one of the fundamental principles of our society."

And of the same opinion was Montesquieu, who gave the high authority of the *Esprit des Lois* to the declaration that

"There is no liberty if the power of judging be not separate from the legislative and executive powers; were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control."

It is to be observed that the wit of man has not yet devised any better way of reaching a just conclusion as to whether a statute does or does not conflict with a constitutional limitation upon legislative power than the submission of the question to an independent and impartial court. The courts are not parties to the transactions upon which they pass. They are withdrawn by the conditions of their office from participation in business and political affairs out of which litigations arise. Their action is free from the chief dangers which threaten the undue extension of power, because, as Hamilton points out in *The Federalist*, they are the weakest branch of government: they neither hold the purse, as does the legislature, nor the sword, as does the executive. During all our history they have commanded and deserved the respect and confidence of the people. General acceptance of their conclusions has been the chief agency in preventing here the discord and strife which afflict so many lands, and in preserving peace and order and respect for law.

Indeed in the effort to emasculate representative government to which I have already referred, the people of the experimenting States have greatly increased their reliance upon the courts. Every new constitution with detailed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders to the legislature is a forcible assertion that the people will not trust legislatures to determine the extent of their own powers, but will trust the courts.

Two of the new proposals in government which have been much discussed, directly relate to this system of constitutional limitations made effective through the judgment of the courts. One is the proposal for the Recall of Judges, and the other for the Popular Review of Decisions, sometimes spoken of as the Recall of Decisions.

Under the first of these proposals, if a specified proportion of the voters are dissatisfied with a judge's decision they are empowered to require that at the next election, or at a special election called for that purpose, the question shall be presented to the electors whether the judge shall be permitted to continue in office or some other specified person shall be substituted in his place. This ordeal differs radically from the popular judgment which a judge is called upon to meet at the end of his term of office, however short that may be, because when his term has expired he is judged upon his general course of conduct while he has been in office and stands or falls upon that as a whole. Under the Recall a judge may be brought to the bar of public judgment immediately upon the rendering of a particular decision which excites public interest and he will be subject to punishment if that decision is unpopular. Judges will naturally be afraid to render unpopular decisions. They will hear and decide cases with a stronger incentive to avoid condemnation themselves than to do justice to the litigant or the accused. Instead of independent and courageous judges we shall have timid and time-serving judges. That highest duty of the judicial power to extend the protection of the law to the weak, the friendless, the unpopular, will in a great measure fail. Indirectly the effect will be to prevent the enforcement of the essential limitations upon official power because the judges will be afraid to declare that there is a violation when the violation is to accomplish some popular object.

The Recall of Decisions aims directly at the same result. Under such an arrangement, if the courts have found a particular law to be a violation of one of the fundamental rules of limitation prescribed in the Constitution, and the public feeling of the time is in favor of disregarding that limitation in that case, an election is to be held, and if the people

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in that election vote that the law shall stand, it is to stand, although it be a violation of the Constitution; that is to say, if at any time a majority of the voters of a State (and ultimately the same would be true of the people of the United States) choose not to be bound in any particular case by the rule of right conduct which they have established for themselves, they are not to be bound. This is sometimes spoken of as a Popular Reversal of the Decisions of Courts. That I take to be an incorrect view. The power which would be exercised by the people under such an arrangement would be, not judicial, but legislative. The action would not be a decision that the court was wrong in finding a law unconstitutional, but it would be making a law valid which was invalid before because unconstitutional. In such an election the majority of the voters would make a law where no law had existed before, and they would make that law in violation of the rules of conduct by which the people themselves had solemnly declared they ought to be bound. The exercise of such a power, if it is to exist, cannot be limited to the particular cases which you or I or any man now living may have in mind. It must be general. If it can be exercised at all it can and will be exercised by the majority whenever they wish to exercise it. If it can be employed to make a Workmen's Compensation Act in such terms as to violate the Constitution, it can be employed to prohibit the worship of an unpopular religious sect, or to take away the property of an unpopular rich man without compensation, or to prohibit freedom of speech and of the press in opposition to prevailing opinion, or to deprive one accused of crime of a fair trial when he has been condemned already by the newspapers. In every case the question whether the majority shall be bound by those general principles of action which the people have prescribed for themselves will be determined in that case by the will of the majority, and therefore in no case will the majority be bound except by its own will at the time.

The exercise of such a power would strike at the very foundation of our system of government. It would be a reversion to the system of the ancient republics where the state was everything and the individual nothing except as a part of the state, and where liberty perished. It would be a repudiation of the fundamental principle of Anglo-Saxon liberty which we inherit and maintain, for it is the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

very soul of our political institutions that they protect the individual against the majority. "All men," says the Declaration, "are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights. Governments are instituted to secure these rights." The rights are not derived from any majority. They are not disposable by any majority. They are superior to all majorities. The weakest minority, the most despised sect, exist by their own right. The most friendless and lonely human being on American soil holds his right to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and all that goes to make them up, by title indefeasible against the world, and it is the glory of American self-government that by the limitations of the Constitution we have protected that right against even ourselves. That protection cannot be continued and that right cannot be maintained, except by jealously preserving at all times and under all circumstances the rule of principle which is eternal over the will of majorities which shift and pass away.

Democratic absolutism is just as repulsive, and history has shown it to be just as fatal, to the rights of individual manhood as is monarchical absolutism.

But it is not necessary to violate the rules of action which we have established for ourselves in the Constitution in order to deal by law with the new conditions of the time, for these rules of action are themselves subject to popular control. If the rules are so stated that they are thought to prevent the doing of something which is not contrary to the principles of liberty but demanded by them, the true remedy is to be found in reconsidering what the rules ought to be and, if need be, in restating them so that they will give more complete effect to the principles they are designed to enforce. If, as I believe, there ought to be in my own State, for example, a Workman's Compensation Act to supersede the present unsatisfactory system of accident litigation, and if the Constitution forbids such a law—which I very much doubt—the true remedy is not to cast to the winds all systematic self-restraint and to inaugurate a new system of doing whatever we please whenever we please, unrestrained by declared rules of conduct; but it is to follow the orderly and ordinary method of amending the Constitution so that the rule protecting the right to property shall not be so broadly stated as to prevent legislation which the principle underlying the rule demands.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The difference between the proposed practice of overriding the Constitution by a vote and amending the Constitution is vital. It is the difference between breaking a rule and making a rule; between acting without any rule in a particular case and determining what ought to be the rule of action applicable to all cases.

Our legislatures frequently try to evade constitutional provisions, and doubtless popular majorities seeking specific objects would vote the same way, but set the same people to consider what the fundamental law ought to be, and confront them with the question whether they will abandon in general the principles and the practical rules of conduct according to principles, upon which our government rests, and they will instantly refuse. While their minds are consciously and avowedly addressed to that subject they will stand firm for the general rules that will protect them and their children against oppression and usurpation, and they will change those rules only if need be to make them enforce more perfectly the principles which underlie them.

Communities, like individuals, will declare for what they believe to be just and right; but communities, like individuals, can be led away from their principles step by step under the temptations of specific desires and supposed expediencies until the principles are a dead letter and allegiance to them is a mere sham.

And that is the way in which popular governments lose their vitality and perish.

The Roman consuls derived their power from the people and were responsible to the people; but Rome went on pretending that the emperors and their servants were consuls long after the Prætorians were the only source of power and the only power exercised was that of irresponsible despotism.

A number of countries have copied our Constitution coupled with a provision that the constitutional guarantees may be suspended in case of necessity. We are all familiar with the result. The guarantees of liberty and justice and order have been forgotten: the government is dictatorship and the popular will is expressed only by revolution.

Nor, so far as our national system is concerned, has there yet appeared any reason to suppose that suitable laws to meet the new conditions cannot be enacted without either overriding or amending the Constitution. The liberty of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contract and the right of private property which are protected by the limitations of the Constitution are held subject to the police power of government to pass and enforce laws for the protection of the public health, public morals, and public safety. The scope and character of the regulations required to accomplish these objects vary as the conditions of life in the country vary. Many interferences with contract and with property which would have been unjustifiable a century ago are demanded by the conditions which exist now and are permissible without violating any constitutional limitation. What will promote these objects the legislative power decides with large discretion, and the courts have no authority to review the exercise of that discretion. It is only when laws are passed under color of the police power and having no real or substantial relation to the purposes for which the power exists, that the courts can refuse to give them effect.

By a multitude of judicial decisions in recent years our courts have sustained the exercise of this vast and progressive power in dealing with the new conditions of life under a great variety of circumstances. The principal difficulty in sustaining the exercise of the power has been caused ordinarily by the fact that carelessly or ignorantly drawn statutes either have failed to exhibit the true relation between the regulation proposed and the object sought, or have gone farther than the attainment of the legitimate object justified. A very good illustration of this is to be found in the Federal Employer's Liability Act which was carelessly drawn and passed by Congress in 1906 and was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, but which was carefully drawn and passed by Congress in 1908 and was declared constitutional by the same court.

Insistence upon hasty and violent methods rather than orderly and deliberate methods is really a result of impatience with the slow methods of true progress in popular government. We should probably make little progress were there not in every generation some men who, realizing evils, are eager for reform, impatient of delay, indignant at opposition, and intolerant of the long, slow processes by which the great body of the people may consider new proposals in all their relations, weigh their advantages and disadvantages, discuss their merits, and become educated either to their acceptance or rejection. Yet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is the method of progress in which no step, once taken, needs to be retraced; and it is the only way in which a democracy can avoid destroying its institutions by the impulsive substitution of novel and attractive but impracticable expedients.

The wisest of all the fathers of the Republic has spoken, not for his own day alone, but for all generations to come after him, in the solemn admonitions of the Farewell Address. It was to us that Washington spoke when he said:

"The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government; but the Constitution which at any time exists, till changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. . . . Towards the preservation of your government, and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular oppositions to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretexts. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the Constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system, and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments as of other human institutions; that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country; that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual changes, from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion."

While in the nature of things, each generation must assume the task of adapting the working of its government to new conditions of life as they arise, it would be the folly of ignorant conceit for any generation to assume that it can lightly and easily improve upon the work of the founders in those matters which are, by their nature, of universal application to the permanent relations of men in civil society.

Religion, the philosophy of morals, the teaching of history, the experience of every human life, point to the same conclusion—that in the practical conduct of life the most difficult and the most necessary virtue is self-restraint. It is the first lesson of childhood; it is the quality for which great monarchs are most highly praised; the man who has it not is feared and shunned; it is needed most where power is greatest; it is needed more by men acting in a mass than by individuals, because men in the mass are more irrespon-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sible and difficult of control than individuals. The makers of our Constitution, wise and earnest students of history and of life, discerned the great truth that self-restraint is the supreme necessity and the supreme virtue of a democracy. The people of the United States have exercised that virtue by the establishment of rules of right action in what we call the limitations of the Constitution, and until this day they have rigidly observed those rules. The general judgment of students of government is that the success and permanency of the American system of government are due to the establishment and observance of such general rules of conduct. Let us change and adapt our laws as the shifting conditions of the times require, but let us never abandon or weaken this fundamental and essential characteristic of our ordered liberty.

ELIHU ROOT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

ANOTHER WORD ON "THE ETHICS OF MIRACLES."

In the June North American Review, the Rev. Dr. S. D. McConnell attempts to show that Biblical miracles are often out of keeping with advanced ethical conceptions. He gives point to his criticism by specifying certain of those miracles and suggesting how they violate what is ethical. He begins by making use of the miracle which the Book of Acts contains, in reference to a certain deliverance from prison experienced by Peter. He considers this account deficient in proper ethical insight, owing to the fact that in connection with it the statement is found, which informs us that when Herod heard of Peter's escape he gave orders for the execution of the prison guards. In thus criticizing this account he has overlooked the fact that if such an indirect result can properly be charged against the miracle, making it out of harmony with the proper conception of God, there are also a great many facts in connection with the conception of the formation and development of the earth and the universe, which he evidently holds, which are not in accord with the highest ethics. As witness of this take the struggle for existence resulting in the survival of the fittest as set before us in evolutionary philosophy. Tennyson described it as "red in tooth and claw," and his sensitive soul was shocked beyond the power of his genius to tell, all of which is plainly indicated in his "In Memoriam." And we may say that a wave of agony rolled round the world through the hearts of multitudes as this idea of the development of life made its way into human thinking. That exceedingly humane scientist, Henry Drummond, did his best to show that the final results would be ample justification of all the immense and varied suffering of the process. Alfred Russell Wallace tried to mitigate it somewhat by advancing the idea, "There is good reason to believe that the supposed torments and miseries of animals have little real existence, but are the reflection of the imagined sensations of cultivated men and women in similar circumstances." But the suffering of the human part of the struggle cannot be thus mitigated. Mr. Huxley, according to Henry Drummond, as he faced "the tremendous problem gave it up and said: 'There is no solution; nature is without excuse.'" Dr. McConnell has committed himself to this evolutionary conception, and having done so, is it not an amazingly inconsistent thing for him to turn around and criticize a miracle, because as an indirect result of it a king ordered the execution of a number of soldiers? If he knows of any more such instances he might put them all together, and having done so, he would not then have a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millionth part of the misery which his evolutionary-working God has ordered in nature for every day of untold millions of ages. To say that God does this in an immanent manner meets no more correctly the protests of our ethical instincts than one may be excused for killing another in an immanent manner, say, by having a sufficient number of mosquitoes, heavily laden with death-generating germs, sting him. Most anybody would have more regard for a person, at least for his courage, who would attack him with a club or a gun, than in any such supposed treacherous manner. And we venture to guess that if any one of us had to face choosing between being executed as those soldiers were, or being subjected to the kind of life which science informs us many of our ancestors had to endure, he would choose the former "mighty quick," notwithstanding the fact that the latter might be in perfect harmony with his view of ethics. The essential fact to keep in mind is just this, however God is conceived of as acting, whether immanently or otherwise, we should in every case apply to the conception the same ethical standard. If we do that in this case the criticism in question will appear infinitely puerile.

The second miracle mentioned by Dr. McConnell is criticized for what he calls its lack of appreciation of "the reign of law," binding the whole universe in one vast system. It is that one which pictures the "standing still" of the sun and moon. The writer of this reply is inclined to the opinion that we have in that a magnificent piece of metaphor, which was no more intended to be understood literally than Christ wished us to interpret thus His parable of the Prodigal Son. But suppose that it was intended to be understood literally; even then the criticism which Dr. McConnell has made may easily be shown to be untenable. While he was insisting on the idea of the universality of the reign of law, why should he have failed to take account of the universality of the being of God as expressed in the Old Testament? The miracle is set before us as something which was wrought, not by a local deity, nor by a god simply of the earth, but by God the infinite; by God who in the beginning created the heavens and the earth; by God who stretches out the heavens as a curtain and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in; by God omnipresent and almighty, as described so wonderfully in the 139th Psalm and in the Book of Job. Here we may, perhaps, refer with profit to a passage written several centuries ago by a theologian whom, very likely, Dr. McConnell does not often refer to, John Calvin. Writing of God's support and preservation of the world and the universe, he said: "To represent God as the Creator only for a moment, who entirely finished all His work at once, were dense and jejune; and in this it behooves us to differ from the heathen so that the presence of the Divine power may appear to us no less in the perpetual state of the world than in its origin. . . . When faith has learned that God is the Creator of all things, it should immediately conclude that He is also their perpetual governor and preserver; and that not by a certain universal motion, actuating the whole machine of the world and all of its respective parts, but by a particular providence sustaining, nourishing, and providing for everything which He has made." When one has such a conception of the relation of God to the universe, or one similar to it, he understands that God, if He wished for some sufficient

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose to restrain somewhat the motion of any part of the universe, could at the same time effect the necessary adjustments throughout the whole universe, even more easily than an engineer applies the brakes and regulates his train-speed to suit his will. This idea of Böotes having to be wrecked in case of any such event is therefore absurd to a mind that keeps in view the reign of almighty power and intelligence. The only way that such a criticism could be justified would be through first showing that the Old Testament does not hold a sufficient idea of the infinity of God.

Returning from this famous miracle of the Book of Joshua to the New Testament, our critic attacks miracles *in toto* as being expressive of partiality on the part of God in His dealings with mankind. Two objections may be made to this criticism. One is that the object in view of the miracles was not primarily the benefit of the individuals who were assisted by them, but the giving of part of the evidence concerning the person and mission of Jesus, so that every miracle is, according to the idea of the New Testament, related to the whole world. It may be illustrated in this way. Nowadays there are expert machinists who travel, demonstrating for their companies. I have known a score of farmers to go miles to see such an expert demonstrate a machine. The farmer on whose place the demonstration occurs may receive a particular benefit which I need not stop to specify, but the demonstration is given for all the farmers of the community. It is the same with the miracles of the Bible; the whole world, according to the conception of the Bible itself, is in different ways related to them. The other objection in point is this: if there is any just ground for such a criticism of the Christian miracles, there is also an equally good ground for criticizing what is taught in the Bible in reference to many other matters. We read that Jesus confined Himself almost exclusively to Palestine, that only in one or two instances did He have anything to do with people of other nations. Why may we not criticize him for this? Why may we not suggest that if He had taken a boat and gone over to Greece and discoursed on Mars Hill He might, far more easily, have got a hearing there than did the Apostle Paul preaching of His Resurrection? Or we may ask, why, instead of preaching in a particular place, one Sermon on the Mount to a few thousand people, did Jesus not do so in many different parts of the country, and give far more people a chance to hear the blessed words fall from His own lips? To Dr. McConnell the miracle is an offense, while Christ's teaching and spirit are everything; but as we have already seen, He did not distribute either His preaching or His companionship as widely as some people might think He should have done. He was apparently more partial with His words than with His reputed miracles, for it is distinctly written that while the multitudes often misunderstood His words, and His apostles also, that He never took the trouble to explain His words to the people, but only to His "inner circle." And instead of being particular to arrange things so that He could be entertained in as many homes of those who believed in Him as possible, it appears that a few homes, notably one at Bethany, had that privilege and blessing. If we begin such a variety of criticism, where can we legitimately stop?

It often happens that one child of a family is possessed of natural

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abilities and charms of character far in excess of all the others; it often happens that a community is blessed only once in centuries with some select and splendid soul. Why should not all the other people born in such a family, or such a community, criticize Providence, working through the natural world, for His apparent partiality? The same question might also be asked in reference to whole nations.

Why, for example, did Providence permit a nation like Rome to dominate the world instead of interfusing enough of intelligence and vigor generally, so that all the nations might have advanced hand in hand, no one being the slave of any other? Are these not just as legitimate questions as are those which Dr. McConnell has asked? Here it will be in place to repeat a statement which has already been made in this article, namely, the essential fact to keep in mind is just this, however God is conceived of as acting, whether immanently or otherwise, we should in every case apply to the conception the same ethical standard.

In connection with this criticism of the reputed miracles of Christ, the surprising assertion is made that Christ "belittles the belief that came from seeing many mighty works." The sources from which we may get our ideas of this are, either the words of Jesus as reported in the New Testament, or our own or other men's ideas formed, in large part, independently of the text. I prefer to form mine on the basis of what is given in the text. Here are some passages bearing on the subject: "And the disciples of John told him of all these things. And John calling two of his disciples sent them to the Lord, saying art thou he that cometh, or do we look for another? And when the men were come unto him, they said, 'John the Baptist has sent us unto thee, saying, art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?' . . . And He answered and said unto them, 'Go your way and tell John what things ye have seen and heard; the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, the poor have the good tidings preached unto them.'" And in His reported lament over certain cities He is represented as having said: "Woe unto thee Chorazin! woe unto thee Bethsaida! for if the mighty works had been done in Tyre and Sidon which were done in you, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." And when He sent forth the Seventy He did not instruct them simply to preach and to teach, but to work miracles; and it is further reported that they returned rejoicing, for one reason, because the "very demons were subject to them."

It is true that Jesus refused to give "signs" to the rulers, but that was because He was too wise to exert Himself to gratify mere curiosity, or to produce a spectacle when those who desired it were positively opposed to Him. He replied to faith and suffering, not to any such requests as the rulers made of him. We can see that in this He acted intelligently. We may also observe that on a few occasions He told those whom He had healed not to report it publicly. Whatever His reasons were for giving such commands, in the face of all the testimony which there is showing that He put high value on His miracles, they do not justify any such an idea as that He did so from any such a motive as this one suggested by Dr. McConnell.

But the most amazing item of this criticism is the approval which it gives to the protest of Zola against the credibility of the record concern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the resurrection of Lazarus. The idea of the whole of this passage from Zola is given in its first sentence, namely: "Master! Master! why have you awakened me to this abominable life?" Lazarus is thus represented as being selfish enough, even in the presence of Jesus, to object to being of service to the world, and also as caring nothing for the grief of his two devoted sisters. Such a spirit is, of course, entirely out of accord with the spirit of Christianity. In a great passage of one of the epistles of the New Testament it is written that angels are often in specific ways "sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation." We may also recall the famous passage from Milton, concluding with the lines:

> "Who best
> Bear His mild yoke, they serve Him best. His state
> Is kingly; thousands at His bidding speed,
> And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
> They also serve who only stand and wait."

But here we have one who is contending, so he says, for the loftiest ethical conceptions, giving his approval to what would have been an expression of contemptible selfishness on the part of Lazarus.

J. Wallace MacGowan.

Hastings House, Norfolk Street, Strand, W. C.
June 21, 1913.

Sir:

My attention has only now been drawn to a review of *Hadji Murad* and *The Light That Shines in Darkness,* published, as long ago as June, 1912, in your influential and widely read magazine. I hope that, even at this late date, you will do me the courtesy of allowing me to point out a couple of mistakes, which do me serious injustice.

In the first place, the reviewer holds me responsible for the translation of *The Light That Shines,* whereas I do not even know who made the version in question.

Secondly, your reviewer holds me guilty of retaining in the text of the Tartar story, *Hadji Murad,* a number of Russian words "to annoy the reader." So different is this from my custom that I should be unable to understand the reproach had the reviewer not been kind enough to quote these "Russian" words: *naïb, kizyak,* etc.—and thereby made it plain that they are not Russian words at all, but Tartar. Tolstoy retains them in his own text because there are no single Russian (nor are there any single English) words which cover the same ground, and the use of circumlocutions would spoil the crisp, concise style in which the story is written. I hoped that my preface and foot-notes had sufficiently explained this point.

Furthermore, I am somewhat perturbed to learn that I am "neither an understanding commentator nor a good translator." This matter is of some importance to me, and as I do not wish the case to go by default, may I beg to call three witnesses for the defense?

Bernard Shaw writes: "Though I cannot say that Mr. Aylmer Maude is the best Tolstoy translator now living, that is only because I cannot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

read the others, and have consequently no right to give my opinion about them. Translating Tolstoy is not a matter of pegging away with a dictionary; it is the labor of rethinking Tolstoy's thought, and re-expressing it in English. Tolstoy himself has appealed to Europe to judge *What is Art?* by Mr. Maude's translation, and not by the censored and mutilated Russian version. And nobody can possibly read it and suppose that Mr. Maude is not either a highly competent translator or else a man of original genius who is writing under the pseudonym of Leo Tolstoy."

A. B. Walkley wrote of one of my translations: "Mr. Aylmer Maude has accomplished an admirable piece of work in this translation, scholarly, solid, conscientious. His notes in their pregnant, concentrated brevity are models of what things should be. For my sins I have to peruse a good many translations in the course of a year, but I have never come across anything so good in its way as Mr. Maude's version of Tolstoy."

Finally, Tolstoy himself wrote of the translations made by my wife and myself: "Better translators, both for knowledge of the two languages and for penetration into the very meaning of the matter translated, could not be invented."

I hope this testimony may be allowed to weigh in the balance against that of my accuser, whose opinion may be entitled to great weight, but whose name I have not the pleasure of knowing.

I am, dear sir,

AYLMER MAUDE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

La France Vivante en l'Amérique du Nord. By M. Gabriel Hanotaux. Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie, 1913.

Last year the eminent French publicist and statesman, M. Gabriel Hanotaux, visited this country with the Champlain Mission charged to present to the American nation on behalf of the Comité France-Amérique, the replica of Rodin's sculptural conception of *La France* which now adorns the monument to the great explorer on the margin of the lake named after him. The mission traveled extensively, there were numerous dinners and addresses, and now M. Hanotaux publishes the present volume which, since it contains so much purely commemorative material, may be regarded in some sort as an official souvenir of the occasion. But it is designed to have an independent value as well. It seeks to further in its own way those ends for which the committee was organized and for which the mission was undertaken. It is, says its author, "a book of action. Its object is concrete and definite: to develop the relation between France and America. This is precisely the aim that the Comité France-Amérique has proposed to itself—the same spirit animates the two works."

It is the spirit of *rapprochement,* and mutual understanding, between the two countries which, during his own Ministry of Foreign Affairs (it was in 1897 in the midst of the acrimonious dispute between Spain and the United States that preceded the outbreak of actual hostilities), he discovered to be deplorably lacking: "Suddenly and from no one knows where, the rumor spread that France was hostile to the great American republic. Certainly we had no need to take part against our neighbors and friends of the peninsula. But if any diplomacy was ever correct and applied conscientiously the rules of neutrality, it was the French diplomacy of the period, as the documents would establish if it were necessary. However, the rumor, once launched, grew till it became menacing throughout all North America. It was an admitted and accepted fact that Americans passing through Paris were hostilely received, molested, maltreated. France was putting herself at the head of a league of hostile nations against the United States! A little more, and she would be taking part in the war! . . . It was," comments M. Hanotaux with deep feeling, "one of the worst moments of my ministerial career; it filled me with rage to be at once *sans reproche* and powerless. It needed incessant vigilance and the employment of all agencies to double this difficult cape."

So the Comité France-Amérique was formed in 1909 for the purpose of removing from the marine charts such dangerous obstacles to inter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

national navigation, and M. Hanotaux's book, reviewing the historic grounds for friendship between the two countries, and seeking to dispel popular prejudices and misconceptions, may with propriety be regarded as a votive candle placed upon the altar of *la bonne Ste. Anne* by a pious sailor who has narrowly escaped shipwreck.

It is a pleasant little book and one that may be read with profit on both sides of the Atlantic. For not only does it recall the common memories of the Revolution, and the indebtedness of the framers of our Constitution to French political philosophers—which in particular we, on our side, are sometimes prone to overlook—but it contains an acute and candid, if somewhat cursory, comparison of the characters of French and American civilization at the present day, with a view to ascertaining in what ways each people might derive advantage from study and assimilation of the other's traits and institutions.

Assuming such assimilation to be possible, what would France gain through a closer contact with North America? The quality of self-control, says M. Hanotaux, is exemplified in the self-possession of the American woman of whom he subscribes himself the admirer: "The American woman is, perhaps, the most remarkable product of the transplantation of the old races to a new soil. A young French woman of the upper classes, having received a slight tincture of American exoticism, would lose nothing of her charm and would gain in savor, in intellectual resources, and in self-possession."

But there would be other benefits as well: "A more intense effort, a more sustained working capacity, a more serious reflection, a physical and moral bearing prouder and more upright, such are the high lessons that the American people can give to a race which, very fortunately, is not afraid of multiplying its tasks and its duties."

In return, France could inoculate America with her *élan chevaleresque,* her readiness to run every risk when a high cause offers, or for the sake of the future: with her intellectual idealism, or abstract passion for truth; and with her practical sagacity in the sphere of delicate social and economic adjustments, to illustrate which M. Hanotaux analyzes several articles of the Code Civil.

But before the younger country will consent to learn from the elder, certain erroneous impressions must be effaced or corrected. M. Hanotaux admits this necessity: "France requires to be defended before America," he asserts, and proceeds loyally to this defense. That "the French people is in decadence," "that France is a species of 'Poland' destined to an early dismemberment," is an opinion that he has found prevalent in America, and he has little trouble in demolishing it with respect both to commercial wealth and to political prestige based upon military power. As for the declining birth-rate, he admits the fact, confesses to a certain disquietude concerning the consequences, but does not despair of some check being found for a phenomenon which is by no means peculiar to France, and which seems to bear some relation to the "human saturation of the tillable soil." Certainly it is a social rather than a racial phenomenon, and is governed by purely local and psychological conditions. "We know," he says, "how vigorous the French birth-rate is in Canada; we know to a less extent that the French race in Algeria is the most prolific of all European stocks. It will be the same,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably, in all colonies where the Frenchman can live. The formula would then be this: where there is available land, men are born. And, as new lands are not lacking to France, she should have, on this head, a recourse against the law which appears to strike her."

He is less successful in dealing with the idea of decadence in the domain of art, for the reason that he falls into the common error of confusing artistic decadence with social and moral disorder. In reality it is with the latter alone that he is concerned. And, as it is a simple matter to show that the charge of immorality can by no means be brought against French literature, any more than against French life, in general, he makes his point sufficiently well for his purposes. At the same time, however, it is at least a curious commentary upon this style of criticism that at the very moment when the moralist is defending art from the capital charge of decadence in the popular sense, this art should actually be showing a more marked dearth of genuine originality and imaginative power than it has shown hitherto for several decades. French literature at the present moment exhibits distinct traits of that exhaustion which from the purely artistic point of view can alone be considered decadent. Doubtless, however, this too is but a temporary phase and has no ulterior significance.

M. Hanotaux's second paper is entitled *La Leçon du Canada,* and is an attempt to bring to bear the bitter experiences of the past upon the problems of modern territorial expansion and empire-building. For the rest, as we have said, the book is made up of collected addresses by the author, and an account of the formation and activities, to date, of the Comité France-Amérique.

THE PROBLEM OF CHRISTIANITY. By JOSIAH ROYCE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Independently of all religions and of all philosophies, no one can sanely deny the importance to mankind of well-developed ethical ideas. Any mode of reasoning, therefore, which tends to clarify these ideas and to give us an even slightly better understanding of what their sanctions may be, is of inestimable value. Few persons, it may be maintained, obey conscience pure and simple; though most, perhaps, would be puzzled to state their ultimate ideals. However much, then, we may rely upon religious intuition or upon a bare "categorical imperative," it is certain that the intellectual concept—whether of God, or country, or simply of another person regarded as a model—is helpful, if not essential. From the viewpoint of conscience the betrayal of a friend, for instance, is simply an evil deed certain to be followed by remorse; but we are quite aware that when we call the betrayer a "traitor" we are taking a more advanced moral ground that when we simply call him a "villain." As in the particular, so in the general case. Broad and well-defined ideas of what we mean by such words as "traitor," and by such words again as "salvation," "sin," "atonement," and the like—all corresponding to some sort of deeply felt inner interests—such ideas, even if they cannot lead us to absolute knowledge, at any rate seem to bring us nearer the threshold of such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knowledge, and they undoubtedly strengthen the moral motives by which we all in a fashion judge and act.

Regarded in this light, the first volume (subtitled "The Christian Doctrine of Life") of Professor Royce's new philosophical treatise, is a notable work of edification. Readers of his previous books need not be reminded of the lucidity, the tact and sympathy, with which he handles problems which are not alone intellectually difficult, but also—as no one makes us feel more keenly—"intensely practical and passionately interesting." Reading this first volume, we have the curious experience—curious to most in this day and generation—of imbibing theology with enjoyment. We taste the savor, composed in equal parts of pleasure and profit, that in times past made the reading of technical theology a favorite exercise for the serious-minded. But as *Treasure Island* to earlier and cruder pirate stories, as *The Ancient Mariner* to the popular ballad—so is Professor Royce's book, with respect to inspiration and acceptability, as compared with the doctrinal theology of an earlier day.

In the author's own words, the problem of Christianity, as carefully stated after much definite discussion, is this: "When we consider what are the most essential features of Christianity, is the acceptance of a creed that embodies these features consistent with the lessons that, so far as we can yet learn, the growth of human wisdom and the course of the ages have taught man regarding religious truth?" In an attempt to throw light upon this question, three characteristic Christian ideas are analyzed and reinterpreted; namely, salvation, original sin, and atonement. The founder of Christianity, Professor Royce believes, purposely left undefined certain central features of his teaching. For example, the gospels nowhere make it wholly clear whether the Kingdom of Heaven was meant to be understood as a state of mind merely, or as an actual community—a social order. As later interpreted, however, by the early Church and especially by the Apostle Paul, the Kingdom of Heaven became practically identified with what Professor Royce calls "the beloved community"—the Church, of which Christ was conceived as the living and informing spirit. Thus "Christian love, as Paul conceives it, takes on the form of loyalty: this is Paul's simple but vast transformation of Christian love." Loyalty, then, to the beloved community is, historically and actually, the central Christian doctrine.

But such loyalty is not the normal result of the processes of growth and civilization. On the contrary, the very social environment that trains us to a high type of self-consciousness causes us to react against it as individuals. "The more outer law there is in our cultivation, the more inner rebellion there is in the very individuals whom our cultivation creates." Thus, "our very consciences are tainted by the original sin of social contentiousness," and it is only through a wholehearted reconciliation with the spirit of the community that we may escape from the domination of the law and of sin.

Supposing, however, that such reconciliation has been achieved—supposing that absolute loyalty has been pledged to the beloved community—a new kind of sin, quite different from the sinfulness born of social discord, becomes possible. Deliberate treason to all that the traitor holds highest is, in fact, according to Professor Royce, the unpardonable sin;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and it dooms the sinner not to a hell of physical torment, but to what the author terms "the Hell of the Irrevocable." No propitiation of an angry God, no sentimental penitence, no acceptance of an act of vicarious suffering, will serve to restore the sinner's shattered inner life. The simple fact remains that he cannot rationally forgive himself for what he has done. Nevertheless, without attempting to forgive the unforgivable, he may, after all, be enabled to view his act in a new light—as part, indeed, of the moral order. Through the good deed of another—a deed which becomes possible only through the traitor's own act of disloyalty—the traitor may in a sense be reconciled to the commission of the disloyal act. "It is impossible but that offenses should come, but woe to them through whom they come." Doubtless the traitor still feels that it were better for him if a millstone has been hung about his neck and he cast into the sea: nevertheless, he knows now that his act has furthered and not frustrated the interests of the beloved community. This then, in the rough, is Professor Royce's doctrine of atonement.

Now, undoubtedly, all this is extremely acceptable to the "modern man." Historically, it places him in touch with the traditional belief. Moreover, it furnishes a resting-point for his faith and a rallying-point for his loyal instincts. Interpreted broadly or narrowly, practically or mystically, the "religion of loyalty" has vitality. Most of us are inclined to accept without too much criticism the idea of a universal community, as something over and above the individual, as a sort of superior being. Here the skeptic finds least clearly marked the boundary between what he practically believes and what he doubts.

However, there inevitably arises the question whether the universal community as an object of loyalty can actually be proved to exist. This is the question metaphysically discussed in the second volume ("The Real World and the Christian Ideas") of *The Problem of Christianity;* and here, it is to be feared, most readers will find the parting of the ways. The question of the existence of the universal community as a real entity involves in the first place an analysis of what is called "the empirical self." It is a commonplace that our idea of the self is indefinitely extensible. It extends into the past and into the future; it extends to our clothes, our friends, and our reputations. On the other hand, few will profess themselves able to locate or define the real central self to which all these things are objective. It seems plausible, however, to regard memory as the cement, so to speak, of individuality. If I should forget all of my past experience could I then remain in any sense the same person?

Obviously here is great opportunity for argument "about it and about." If I were condemned to suffer excruciating torture, I should be in no wise reconciled to the prospect of being assured that before undergoing the pain I should completely forget all that I ever knew, although, if the memory theory be true, I ought to be able to think of the tortured person as entirely distinct from myself. Doubtless this is because there is no such thing as complete forgetting. My brain, unless it were fresh created, would remain in some degree affected by the past, and, so far forth, would remain the same brain. If my brain could be, so to speak, dissolved and then endowed with consciousness anew, then

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indeed there might be no connection between the new individual and the old, but it would still be open to objectors to say that the difference of identity was due to a new act of creation and not to the destruction of memory in an individual already created.

Discouraged by the futility of such argument, we cannot but be a little skeptical as to the reality of what Professor Royce calls "communities of memory," and "communities of hope." Though we hope and remember the same things, are we really any the less isolated as individuals? It is difficult to believe so. It is not, however, upon the community of hope or of memory that Professor Royce really rests his case for the existence of the Universal Community. The core of his metaphysical theory is the doctrine of the "community of interpretation."

It is not possible here to go into the technical discussion designed to prove that "interpretation" is a logical process co-ordinate with conception and with perception, nor is it necessary. "The proper object of interpretation is either something of the nature of a mind, or else a process which goes on in the mind, or, finally, is a sign or expression whereby some mind manifests its existence and processes." We may accept this as an adequate definition, and we may concede that men are constantly engaged in interpreting their past selves to their future selves, even though we may not be able to make much of such assertions as that "time expresses a system of essentially social relations," and that "our very conception of our temporal experience, as of all happenings, is neither a conception nor a perception, but an interpretation." The doctrine of interpretation, if accepted, would unquestionably meet pragmatism on its own ground and defeat it; but it should be noted in passing that it is a very different thing to say, as the Pragmatists do, that our ideas are working plans *and no more,* and to argue that because they *are* more than merely working plans, something else is true.

What the "something else" in this case is, may be imperfectly indicated by brief quotations. "The relations," writes Professor Royce, "exemplified by the man who at a given present moment interprets his past to his future are precisely analogous to the relations which exist when any past state of the world is at any present moment so linked through a definite historical process with the coming state of the world, that an intelligent observer who happened to be in possession of the facts could, were he present, interpret to a possible future observer the meaning of the past. . . . What our own inner reflection exemplifies is outwardly embodied in the whole world's history. For what we all mean by past time is a realm of events whose historical sense, whose records, whose lessons, we may now interpret. . . . Any conversation with other men, any process of that inner conversation whereof our individual self-consciousness consists, any scientific investigation, is carried on under the influence of the generally subconscious belief that we are all members of a community of interpretation."

With the general tenor of all this we can all quite unaffectedly agree. Deep within us is the conviction, subconscious or not, that our unity with other men is not a mere matter of resemblance, or of being, so to speak, "in the same boat." But the fundamental question remains:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

granting that we all do make use of a mental process which is neither purely conceptual, nor purely perceptual, nor merely a union of perception and conception—a process, moreover, that is "social" in its structure—and granting that the universe lends itself to this process of interpretation, does it follow that a universal community exists in any sense which can inspire loyalty? To speak somewhat summarily of a treatise that certainly deserves and requires the most careful, detailed analysis, it seems that no one but a born idealist can be quite convinced by Professor Royce's method of proof.

UNIVERSITY AND HISTORICAL ADDRESSES. By JAMES BRYCE. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Occasional addresses commonly do not make the most delectable reading; it is generally too much to hope that they will either stir us to Olympian laughter or surprise us with profoundly original thought. On this account we admire the more the man who, despite the limits of an occasion, manages to say something, and to say it well. These addresses of Mr. Bryce's, delivered during his stay in this country as England's ambassador, do not bore us in the exordium, the middle part invariably contains something of value, and the peroration in each case is not only logically effective but winning. Mr. Bryce knows how to make the necessary introduction tactful and not tedious, and he puts the warmth of personality into familiar ideas and associations. Having to speak upon a great variety of subjects, from "The Beginnings of Virginia" and "What University Instruction May Do to Provide Intellectual Pleasure for Later Life" to "The Constitution of the United States," he has given eloquent expression to sound opinions, impressing his readers with a rational faith in realizable ideals.

Timely and convincing is the moderate plea for classical learning, which Mr. Bryce defends as on the whole more suited to further the ends of intellectual pleasure in later life than the sciences. Seldom has the liberal common-sense view of education been better expressed than in the following: "All education has two sides. It is meant to impart the knowledge, the skill, the habits of diligence and concentration which are needed to secure practical success. It is also meant to form character, to implant taste, to cultivate the imagination and the emotions, to prepare a man to enjoy those delights which belong to hours of leisure and the inner life." Speaking on another subject, the development of the common law, the author points out that the similarity in fundamental legal ideas between England and the United States is "a bond of union and sympathy whose value can hardly be overrated." In a later chapter, he frankly compares English and American methods of legislation, making various general suggestions of a highly practical nature. An appreciative consideration of the character and views of Thomas Jefferson leads to a discussion of the all-important question, "How far is it true that the people are sure to be right?" and to forcible emphasis of the wholesome moral: "No one must ever be afraid to be in a minority. . . . Where the question is one requiring wide knowledge or serious and independent thought, he who is in a minority is at least

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as likely to be right as he who is in a majority." Touching upon topics less profound, Mr. Bryce is equally happy, and his suggestions regarding such matters as private reading and public speaking are as sensible and usable as they are well expressed. Sparkling good sense and mellow wisdom make these addresses far more rewarding than are most collections of the sort.

GERMANY AND THE GERMANS. By PRICE COLLIER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Mr. Collier has written a thoroughly readable if somewhat superficial book—a book of social and general observation, with a tendency to expand into world politics and political economy. It contains about the mixture of witty comment, solid thought, and felicitous generalization that one would expect to find in the conversation of a well-read, well-traveled man who professes to be master of nothing in particular. The historical introduction is somewhat floundering, but that may be skipped.

The chief impression, perhaps, that the author gives us of Germany as a whole is that of a people less formidable and politically more submissive than we are accustomed to think them. The Germans, in fact, are "not at all what the Americans and English think they are. They want peace, and we think they want war. The huge armaments are intended to frighten us. . . . They are the last comers into the society of nations and they mean to insist upon recognition. But this demand is an artificial one so far as the great mass of Germans is concerned." The nation, in fact, has but recently been hammered into its present shape. What we see chiefly is the result of the hammering process—a process absolutely dependent upon a strong centralized control. What the author would have us see is a populace somewhat crude, somewhat naif, somewhat lacking in confidence, initiative, *savoir faire*. Of these defects the tendency toward uniform-wearing, both material and spiritual, is symptomatic.

Mr. Collier has a genuine man-to-man sort of respect for the Kaiser, and seems to understand the point of view of a ruler who believes that he rules by divine right. Ruling by divine right, one sees, is a rather high calling for a man who takes it seriously and responsibly. On the other hand, it is justly pointed out that much of the obvious efficiency of German methods is due not so much to inward growth as to outward pressure. We cannot do all the things the Germans do, not because we do not know how, but because there is no one to make us do them, and because if there were, we would probably recalcitrate. The constant pounding-in of patriotism through the German educational and social system, Mr. Collier finds somewhat nauseating. "We do not find it necessary to feed our patriotism with a nursing bottle," he remarks.

For the social legislation which Germany has carried so far, Mr. Collier has no manner of use. Paternalism is but another name for slavery, and Germany furnishes an object-lesson in its evil effect. "Nowhere has socialistic legislation been so cunningly and skilfully used for the enslavement of a people. No small part of every man's wages is paid to him in insurance—insurance for unemployment, for accident,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sickness, and old age. There is but faint hope of saving enough to buy one's freedom, and if the slave runs away he leaves, of course, all the premiums he has paid in the hands of his master." It should be noted, however, that Mr. Collier approaches all such questions from the standpoint of individualism and philosophic democracy. He is all for competition and the survival of the fittest. His classical Americanism—not, of course, at all spread-eagly, but pleasantly cosmopolitan—seems a little inadequate in view of our own actual problems. It is refreshing to read of the German army, not as a world menace, but as a national school of hygiene and character.

Germany and the Germans is not a fault-finding book, but on the contrary conveys an effect of warm appreciation. Not too cleverly epigrammatic to be often just and informing, it can be criticized chiefly as a little too long, a little too loose and sweeping in its treatment.

THE UNREST OF WOMEN. By EDWARD SANDFORD MARTIN. New York and London: D. Appleton & Co., 1913.

Nothing can be more charming than Mr. Martin's mingling of wit and wisdom in fluent talk, whether his subject be "The Luxury of Children," "The Reflections of a Beginning Husband," or, as in the present case, "The Unrest of Women." Mr. Martin is an optimist who believes in the essential reasonableness of things as they are. He counsels us to enjoy the honest satisfactions the gods send, and not to quarrel with the order of nature. Good sense and charity, expressing themselves in conduct and politics, are the cures, he believes, of most evils. It is natural that he should lay stress upon the thesis that marriage is woman's natural career, and it is characteristic of him that he succeeds in enforcing this thesis without offense. Recognizing the vital differences of sex, and perceiving their effects as influencing manifold interests, he yet refrains from the folly of talking as if men and women were of different clay or had different souls, and he deals amusingly with the extremes of the extremists.

Nevertheless, his word upon feminine unrest seems to come a little late in the day. Something is seriously, if temporarily, wrong with the present order of things, and if Votes for Women is not the cure something else perhaps is. Mr. Martin himself remarks that unrest is world-wide, and that its underlying cause seems to be economic. Now this is the very point on which we should like advice. We are contemplating, wisely or not, changes—political, economic, and social. We are asking ourselves whether time-honored laws, institutions, and even constitutions, may not be changed for the better. It is profitable to us to be gently warned away from extremes and to be reminded of the influences that after all keep humanity, on the whole, in the path of peace and progress; but we need practical advice more than quieting assurance. It is all very well to say that religion is the only force that can bring men's conflicting desires into harmony, but religion seems to be changing, like everything else. Mr. Martin's book smoothes over rather than solves the problems it raises.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED